

Values And Education In Independent India

by

Dr. G. N. KAUL, Ph.D.
Field Adviser
N.C.E.R.T. New Delhi.



With a Foreword by
Prof. Prem Kirpal
Ex-Educational Adviser,
Ministry of Education
Government of India, New Delhi
And
Ex-President Executive Board
UNESCO

Bhargava Book House
101/102, AGBA-282002

The Associated Publishers

2960, Kacha Bazar, Post Box No. 56

AMBALA CANTT.—133001

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Price Rs. Twenty five only

Published by Shri V.M. Vaid, Prop: THE ASSOCIATED PUBLISHERS,
2960, Kacha Bazar, Post Box No. 56, Ambala Cantt. and
Printed at THE GIRI PRINTERS, Railway Road, Ambala City.

FOREWORD

With Independence in 1947 Indian Society entered a new era of rapid changes, bringing both formidable challenges and fresh opportunities. The need for new orientations in all spheres of life, often labelled as the process of modernization, called for a revolutionary transformation of educational objectives and programmes. In essence, this radical transformation of education is directed to the creation and projection of values relevant to the needs of our times.

It is universally recognized that the concept of education needs to be extended and widened in time and space. It should be extended to **life-long-education**, by a closer integration of formal and informal education, and it should be widened to include culture and leisure time activities. Formal education, informal education and culture form a trinity that needs to be welded together into a single, unified force for raising the quality of life in all countries.

Educational objectives need to be reviewed and re-defined. In general, education contributes to the training and development of three aspects of man—the citizen, the worker, and the human person. Training for citizenship, for harmonious and creative living with his fellow beings in society at the local, national, and world levels, is the obvious need of peoples. The relevance of education to work is more difficult to spell out in practical terms, but it is absolutely essential to give the individual through his work not only a real and worthwhile satisfaction, but also the opportunity to grow; in addition it is vital to the strength and health of society. The development of the human person, which is larger than his effectiveness as a citizen and his efficiency as a worker, has been generally and, often vaguely, recognized to be an over-all educational aim, but little has been done to give this aspect a tangible form and a concrete programme. Instead of being at the centre of educational activity it has been relegated to its fringes, often drawing

merely pious hopes and platitudes from the educator. What is now needed is to give this aspect of education its due place and to develop a concrete programme of life-long education integrated with culture and centred on the search for and practice of new and relevant values. Such a programme should be worthy of satisfying the needs of contemporary man in a rapidly changing situation in which man becomes increasingly the maker of his own destiny, a decisive force directing the process of evolution. This requires education of man for innovation and creativity in quest of the quality of life. The high-lighting of this aim would require a radical transformation of the nature and process of higher education especially for the youth in the age group 17 to 25, involving a drastic re-orientation of institutional structures, the content of education and its methodology. The youth must be afforded opportunities for participation in the life of the larger community during the actual span of higher education and it must be given freedom and scope to influence society, to recreate its values and enhance its worth. This is the crux of the youth revolution of our times that is in progress everywhere in different forms, manifestations, and slogans, but sharing basically the same vision pulsating all society. This imposes on the educator a task of immense complexity and great urgency.

In this book on "Values and Education in Post Independent India", the author, Dr. G. N. Kaul, has made a valuable contribution to educational thinking on a subject of great importance. His deep awareness of the traditional and indigenous features of Indian thought and society and the contemporary needs and developments now in progress has been well reflected in the essays which would interest and benefit both the general reader and the student of education.

Prem Kirpal.

INTRODUCTION

The question of values has been exercising the minds of thinkers around the world including our own country for the last many years. They feel the need of a new value pattern for reconstructing the human community. The need is no less in our own country. In fact if the idea that India is faces any severe danger of self amaltitation, it is the one that emanates from the character of its present value pattern. This is due to many factors i.e. emergence of the country as a free and independent nation; closer contact with the rest of world particularly Britain, U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. and other western countries and the influences that emanate from these, the speedy impact of science and technology and the process of modernization on all aspects of life. The result has been that we have begun to give the same meaning to science, technology and modernization as the west has. Naturally also, we have begun to reap similar fruit as the west has. This rises the question whether, the meaning, interpretation and use that India should made of science and technology etc. should be based on the culture of the west or that of India. It is true that science and technology is universal. But what use you make of it, is an open question. We can, as we often have, use it for the destruction of man; we can also, as we oftener have, use if for the growth of man. What use Science ? is therefore a vital question that needs to be answered. I am of the view that while India has to accept unreservedly the age of science, technology and the process of modernization, the meaning given to these has to be in the context of Indian culture and philosophy. India, has through the centuries, believed in a quality of life which, in essence, means goodness, truth, beauty and peace and consequently the meaning etc., to the new forces of science and technology and the process of modernization needs to be given in terms of these philosophical and cultural concepts and not in those of the west. This, I consider shall be the most fundamental contribution that the country can make to human thought.

The approach adopted here has been to describe the position that now prevails in the country with occasional references to the position as it obtains outside the country. The treatment does not offer any solution nor does it give any programmes of action. The feeling is that the complexity and dimensions of the problem are so great and extensive that no one culture, organisation, or individual can offer a workable and effective solution or programme. Nevertheless it places implicit faith in the ability and capacity of schools to function as the mainspring for initiating programmes for a value pattern which can help in understanding and utilizing science, technology and the process of modernization for improving the quality of life.

Chapter one describes the different trends of thought and the process through which they were converging on two main streams almost of opposite characteristics. This process was the beginning of the value conflict.

Chapter two states how the intellectual approach succeeded and effected a shift in our value pattern.

Chapter three describes the effect of these trends on the Indian educational thought, resulting in the acceptance of western notions of education, institution and individual. This new value pattern placed limitations on the freedom of the teacher which reduced him to the position of a servant and not a builder of the society.

Chapter four describes the confusion that has overtaken people in almost all walks of life with regard to moral values. It also describes how difficult it has become for schools to carry out any effective programmes of moral education in the light of adult behaviour in and outside the school.

Chapter five offers a synoptic view of the Gandhian Values in the background of a fast and subtle invasion of the indigenous value system by the non-Indian. It also discusses the effects of this invasion is producing on the Indian life style.

Chapter six tries to focus attention on the imbalances of values in ancient and recent Indian thought and makes a plea to bring about a balance in them,

Chapter seven discusses Gandhian values in the present day world context. It throws some light on the existing value pattern and the quality of life it has produced in the various parts of the world. In this context, it poses the question of the desirability of evolving or adopting an alternative value pattern which could lead to the development of a higher quality of life.

Chapter eight discusses education in terms of quality of life. It tries to expose the urges, aspirations and confusions of the developing and the developed nations including India. It draws attention to the world wide compulsions and conditions that lead human thought including Indian thought to build up a value pattern which is very likely to help humanity to take the next inevitable step towards a higher aspiration and a nobler quality of life.

I have received a number of reactions to one of the papers now included as Chapter IV in this brochure from many eminent educationists. I thought it advisable to append the extracts to the brochure in the hope that they may serve as a provocative for further discussion or help in preparing a preliminary approach to education in values.

Today there is a world wide search for a new value pattern. In this small new world, values may ultimately be universal but attempts and approaches for its search have to be many and different. This brochure is a very humble attempt in this direction. If it can help in attracting attention or generating informed discussion of the problem in the country, I would feel amply rewarded.

I thank the Editor, The Quest in Education, Bombay for permitting me to reprint papers which now form Chapters 4, 5, 6, 7. I also thank the eminent educationists who sent their reaction to the paper on Moral Education and permitted me to publish their views on the subject. I am also thankful to Editor Journal of Education and Psychology for permitting me to publish the paper on Gandhian Values in Education.

I am highly grateful to Professor Prem Kirpal Ex-Secretary, Government of India, Ministry of Education and Ex-President,

Executive Board, UNESCO for writing the foreword and for allowing me to publish the paper on Gandhian Values in the Present Day World Context which I wrote at his instance.

I cannot afford to forget to thank my daughter Bimla for going through the manuscript and offering many valuable suggestions.

G. N. Kaul

CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| I | THE BEGINNINGS OF VALUE CONFLICT | 9 |
| II | THE SHIFT IN VALUES | 21 |
| III | THE SOCIAL VALUE PATTERN AND THE FREEDOM OF TEACHER | 33 |
| VI | MORAL EDUCATION AND THE SCHOOL | 44 |
| V | GANDHIAN VALUES IN EDUCATION | 55 |
| VI | BALANCING VALUES IN INDIAN EDUCATION—SOME ASPECTS | 64 |
| VII | GANDHIAN VALUES IN THE PRESENT DAY WORLD CONTEXT | 79 |
| VIII | QUALITY OF LIFE AND EDUCATION | 106 |
| IX | APPENDICES | 121 |

Chapter 1

The Beginnings Of Value Conflict

Education is primarily an attempt by a community not only for preserving all that is the best on it, but also for self renewal; it is an attempt to decide what the community should be like the next moment or the next day. While it is possible to state or describe the present or the past, it is not easy to say as to what tomorrow could or should be like. But this is exactly the function of education. Education, therefore, is an attempt by a community to project into the future or the unknown and so process the efforts that the unknown is visualized and is given concrete shape, method and process. In doing this the community is closely involved in examining various factors, the past and the present as well as the needs and aspirations of the members of the community in a given situation. The members of a group always work under a certain frame of reference. There are always before them a number of alternatives out of which they have to choose. The process of choosing from the alternatives is essentially a value process, for you tend to choose that which you think most valuable or most important from your point of view. The most important task, therefore, becomes to make choices out of the available options. How does a community make these choices? The availability of a choice and the right to exercise it are indeed attributes of freedom. But neither an individual nor a country is free enough to make a choice. The exercise is determined or at least influenced by the country's thinking and experience at the moment. And the thinking and experience in turn are closely influenced by the frame of reference in which a particular community lives. The entire educational effort is indeed matter of value.

Values changes from time to time, country to country and people to people. A value pattern for instance developed

in an affluent country would be and indeed is different from a value pattern developed by a poor country. They have actually, coined words like "culture of poverty" and "culture of affluence." The value pattern of an affluent section of the society in one part of the country or even a city could be different from the value pattern developed by a comparatively poorer section of the society in some other part of the country. In the process of value formation, there are always strains and stresses, and periods of comparative clarity and confusion. And since the values govern behaviour pattern, the clarity or confusion in them is reflected in the behaviour pattern. India is today passing through such a value conflict. This is manifest in all fields of life and particularly education. And so long as we do not remove this conflict, the conflict in our behaviour will continue.

Contact with the west particularly England marks the beginning of the present value conflict in India. The influence emanating from it worked in various ways. The administrators created one set of tensions and reactions and the scholars, philosophers and scientists another. The nature of this contact, however, was different from that of Muslims. The contact with Muslims had indeed led to the enrichment of Indian life in many ways. But, generally, it had led the Hindus to revert back into the four walls of their houses and become increasingly defensive and narrow in outlook. The muslim contact had not liberalized the Hindu thought in any appreciable measure. The British contact did. It was, as stated above, due, not to the British administrators, but to the British Philosophers, the Scientists and free thinkers. It was equally due to the continental scholars and orientalist who studied Indian classics, art, sculpture, painting, medicine etc., and explained it both to the West and the East. It was the work of these scholars which held the mirror before the Indian and helped him to see himself in his truer form. One of the ways in which the political system and institutions of the west influenced Indians was the effectiveness of such institutions in England and the need to create similar ones in India. This was done with the help of some Britishers

themselves. The movement soon took the form of a revolt against the foreign rule. This upsurge focused attention on a new set of values. Earlier the work of the British and colonial scholars, free thinkers and others had begun to create a sense of pride in the life and literature of the country and its ancient culture. The revolt against the foreign rule now created a sense of confidence in the resilience and stability of Indian thought and its capacity to overcome foreign onslaught. It also developed a faith that India had something new, which in reality was something very old to her, to offer to the world a new and refreshing message of the divineness and universality of man and nature.

The period, it must be said was one of the most creative periods in the history of the country during the last few centuries. It produced a galaxy of distinguished Indians in the various fields of thought and activity. Their life and work constituted a serious effort to reconstruct the Indian thought in the new context.

This effort presents four distinct approaches. These could be called that of the :—

- (1) religionism
- (2) revivalism
- (3) progressives eclecticism
- (4) intellectualism

The approach by religionists presented two well defined directions. One was advocated by the religious fanatics of the various religions. They presented a narrow outlook of the religion they professed and virtually worked against all progressive measures, educational, social or any other. These elements, as is well known, were effectively exploited by the British administrators to sow the seeds of disintegration and discord among the various religious communities. They utilized the religious fanaticism mainly for political ends. This narrow outlook continued to confuse the Indian mind and eventually led to the division of the country into two nations. This done, it left

a disastrous legacy that Hindus and Muslims are two nations and the two cannot live together. Pakistan, the originator of the theory, carried the idea further and has through various ways even genocide in Bangla Desh managed to purify Pakistan of non Muslim and non-conformist elements by sending them back to India. In India both Hindus and Muslims feel staggered. These occasional purges in Pakistan damage the cause of secularism in India. There is no dearth of persons now who ask "if Muslims and Hindus cannot live together in Pakistan, can they do so in India? Some also ask "can India pursue secularism if Pakistan continues to advocate the ideal which is just the opposite to secularism that of theocracy or a religious state. Fortunately, the way has been shown by the people of Bangla Desh and its venerable leader Sheikh Mujibur Rehman. The efforts as we have all seen, has and shall continue to be very great. Great ideals indeed need to be supported and maintained by great sacrifices.

The liberalizing influence, that a religion essentially is, was converted and utilized as an effective obstacle in the way of emancipation of the Indian intellect.

The other approach was represented by really liberalizing influence by saints like Shri Rama Krishna, his disciple Shri Vivekananda and recently Shri Aurobindo. They reiterated the essential religious message that man is of divine origin, and is, therefore, universal. No national boundaries or religious limitations or economic philosophies can circumscribe his universality and if he so desires, he has the potential to experience this universality in him.

The approach of the revivalists was not as narrow as that of the narrow religionists; it was wider in outlook. They were proud of the cultural excellence of ancient India and were of the view that its revival was the most successful way of leading India to progress and independence. Shri B.G. Tilak, Lala Lajpat Rai, Gopal Krishna Gokhale were some of the leading representatives of this approach. They interpreted the Indian

religious art and literature to suit the political needs of the time. Tilak for instance is known to have invoked the entire cultural and religious literature for upholding the call for independence as "the birth right of every Indian." The revivalists did not succeed in re-establishing an ancient India in a modern world, but they did succeed in effectively reminding the Indian of some of the basic values of Indian life and as such proved a check upon the extremists. It may be recalled that at this time most of the western educated Indians had begun to look down upon everything Indian and admired everything that was western.

The progressive eclecticism is best expressed by the Gandhian thought. Gandhi, it might be recalled used to say that he would like to keep the windows and doors of his house open, but he would not like to be blown off his feet. Gandhiji tried to bring out Indian thought from the quagmire of religious fanaticism and revivalist make-believe. He believed in the excellence and sublimity of Indian culture but he was painfully aware of numerous problems India faced. He saw no use of this culture if it did not help in the solution of Indian problems. Most of the leaders who had preceded him in religion or in politics had extolled the greatness of Indian religion, art, culture etc., but had not been able to utilize it for solving the problems that India faced. The unique credit for utilizing the Indian thought and culture for the solution of Indian problems goes to Gandhi alone.

Gandhi, as we know, was born and brought up in a traditional upper middle class Hindu family and educated in a free country, England. The position in which he was placed in his childhood seems to have influenced his thought tremendously. He began his life by knowing and appreciating some of the noblest ideas and ideals in Indian life and as he grew in years, and went to England for higher education he breathed the atmosphere of freedom and the ways in which a free people work and live. But his basic approach to life was determined by some of the basic ideas of Indian culture and it seems that when he looked on the west, his appreciation of it was influenced by this

approach. He appreciated the west's love for freedom, but he was aware of the fact that the west had denied it to many other people. He appreciated its sensitiveness to Science and industry, but he was also aware of the fact that the western industry, technology and Science had led them to exploit the weaker sections of humanity all over the world and that it had accentuated the problems of social and economic injustice. He also felt that the machine would progressively undermine the uniqueness and individuality of man and instead of being the master he would become a servant of the machine. He felt that the west was exploiting nature more than was necessary. Tagore, a contemporary of Gandhi, had also expressed his views on man-nature relationship. He had declared that man in India is not out to conquer nature but to live in harmony with it. Gandhi shared this view. He was against exploiting both nature and man. Gandhi was not enamoured of wealth and power. He would, as he actually did live a "good life", no matter if it was economically poor. He believed in good life and did not think economic affluence was necessary for it. In fact, he thought, it was a hinderance for leading such life. Instead, he believed in a comparatively poorer standard if that meant the uplift of all. If this was to be achieved, there could be no place for exploitation of man by man.

This basic philosophy provided him with an answer to the economic, social, political and educational problems of the country. He, therefore, built the image of a society where there would be no exploitation, where all men would be equal and free, where economy would be decentralized and each village or a unit of area would be self-sufficient. Above all where the behaviour of man in the society will be based on non-violence and truth.

The operative aspect of this philosophy has been the most revolutionary in the recent years. It erased the authoritarian character of the Hindu society and brought about, at the theoretical and legal level, equality between the high and low sections of the society. It strove to bring the different religious

communities together; it showed its concern nothing for the rich or the wealthy, but also for the ill clothed, ill fed, semi-starved peasant and his village. It offered inspiration for the development of a political weapon - Non-violence and truth. This was a weapon which at the moment caught the imagination of the entire country as the most suitable weapon for a dependent people who could in no case fight a mighty empire with the force of arms or violence. To Gandhi, however, it was not a matter of expediency or a weapon of momentary utility. For him it contained values which are basic to humans respect for truth and respect for life - not only human but all life. In criticism it may be said, sought to find solutions of Indian problems mainly on the basis of Indian thought and tradition. It, however, did not accept all traditions. It accepted some, rejected others. Nevertheless, it did emphasise some of the age-old values and to that extent did not accept the western values.

The intellectual approach was typified by leaders like Rammohan Roy, Agarkar, and M. N. Roy. The most outstanding, however of them all who wanted to build the Indian people on rational basis and who would like them to depend more and more on the intellect rather than on traditional authority, was Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru. He was not only the accredited leader of the masses, but also of intellectuals.

He was born in a Brahmin family and inherited the traditions and freedom which the Brahmins had enjoyed throughout the centuries. Born in one kind of freedom, he was educated in another—a freedom which one of the best schools of free and democratic England could offer. As he grew, he combined in himself the spirit of the earliest rebels in India, the Charvaks who would not accept the authority of the Vedas or of the pre-Budhists, Sophists, who were on the look out for a synthesis of the old and new; or the scientist and humanist of the west, who strengthened his belief in the human intellect as the most dependable instrument for human progress. His belief in secularism; his ardent desire to develop the "scientific temper", his hatred of religious fanaticism or of narrow parochialism or of

castism or his big programmes of establishing a net work of Science Laboratories or of research and technological institutions were the various forms that his philosophy took. He was convinced that if the Indian masses had to be freed from various kind of bondage, all efforts to do this must be based on intellectual approach to solve them. This was one of the most difficult assignments, that he could give to himself or to the country and it continues to be the most worthwhile assignment that any leader or any country can give to itself.

Conditions in India then and even now are difficult. People are moved more by traditional, provincial or communal consideration rather than by objective, reasoned considerations that an intellectual approach demands. Yet he fought hard and to the end. Some communal organisations, struck hard against these theories which were, in fact, his very life breath and the stuff out of which he was made. One of the most well known examples of this attack on his theories and principles was made by the Muslim League under Mr. Jinha's leadership. The League and Mr. Jinha almost destroyed all his theory of secularism, and made him agree to the creation of a religious Pakistan. In spite of the great blow that the League gave to his theories, he loved Muslims, championed their cause and laid the foundations of a secular State though it could have been easy for him to lay the foundations of a Hindu State. He did so not because he wanted to oblige those Muslims who had not gone over to Pakistan, but because his approach to life was determined by intellectual and rational considerations. This approach has slowly been taking roots and yielding fruit and the younger generations both Hindus and Muslims are getting attracted more and more to it. It is succeeding in many states of the country but its greatest triumph has come from the neighbouring Bangla Desh, the sacred land that gave birth to Tagore, Nuzural Islam and Sheikh Mujibur Rehman. There is no doubt that the ideology will now get speedier momentum, hasten, the problem of national integration and what is more usher in an era of more rational and less fanatic and parochial attitude and behaviour.

It has been said about him that an intellectual par excellence he had a number of inner contradictions. While he disregarded certain traditions, he valued many more. He willed that his ashes should be emerged in the eternally revered Ganges. He did not believe in astrology but, he is reported to have advised his sister to have the horoscope of a newly born grandson prepared by a competent Astrologer.

One of the strongest contradictions, however, in his life was his getting close to Mahatama Gandhi and to work as his closet follower and disciple. Gandhi has been called a revivalist, a traditionalist, even an anti intellectual, Gandhi drew his inspiration and strength from a certain closeness to the masses and to the Indian tradition. As discussed above, he believed in finding solutions to Indian problems through Indian through mooring and for this purpose he utilized the cultural content of the country for developing the instrument with which he fought the British Empire. He did not believe in some of the Western concepts like "standard of life" in terms of its monetary value though he did believe in improving the quality of life in terms of goodness. Gandhi, it needs to be reiterated, was not in favour of poverty. He in fact spent his whole life in trying to lessen its intensity. But he was not in favour of affluence either. Nehru was different. He could not see any reason why the Indian could not live as easy and comfortable a life as any other national in the world could.

He did not see any contradiction between 'good life' and comfortable life. He therefore, could not see economic salvation of India in Gandhi Ji's small scale and cottage industry. He believed in setting up large scale and cottage industries as soon as possible. He did believe in truth and non-violence but would not hesitate to depart from it, if there was need to do so. There were thus deep and fundamental differences between Gandhi Ji and Nehru and yet Nehru accepted Gandhi as his leader. Why was this so? Nehru did so not because he believed in Gandhi's economic or social theories, but because Gandhi had a practical programme for the emancipation of the country. Freedom

movement, prior to Gandhi Ji's leadership suffered from the well known Indian weakness for passing pious resolutions without backing them by action programmes. Nehru had seen the futility of this approach and when Gandhi came forth with a practical programme, Nehru accepted the programme not the ideology.

The approach of the intellectuals thus was to reject all kinds of authority, religious traditional, societal. They seem to have placed great faith in human intellect and reason as an instrument for the development of the country. They however, do not seem to have sufficient time to see in a wider perspective the consequences that science and technology was bringing about in the west. It had not inspite of all the material prosperity it had brought about, resulted in developing an intellectual and scientific behaviour among the people; nor does it seem to be doing so now. Even today, the biggest and the most powerful democratic country of the world—America is more a "business government" or a "political government" and not a value which democracy essentially is. This probably seems to be the reason why the Indian intellectuals at the moment could not foresee the range of desirable or undesirable changes which could develop through the introduction of science and technology, inspite of the original intent of developing an intellectual and scientific outlook and temper among the Indian people.

Introduction of Science and technology in the life of India, seemed at the moment, to be the most suitable tools for doing so. The intellectuals however, do not seem to have realized that science and technology could bring about many changes without essentially developing an intellectual and scientific outlook among the Indian people.

The independence of India marks the beginning of a new ideological and value era. Tragically, though perhaps symbolically, Gandhi was killed immediately after India secured independence. The Indian National Congress which now formed the Government was committed to a particular ideology. This ideology was comprehensive.

The people were committed to remove poverty, social and economic inequality, provide free, compulsory and universal primary education and so on. The most difficult aspect therefore, was not forming aims and objectives of the society, but the method of achieving them. How was India to remove poverty? How was it going to bring about social and economic justice? How was it going to remove chances of exploitation and help people to behave on the basis of nonviolence and truth or on the basis of intellectual understanding and reason? Would economic and social justice be achieved more effectively and quickly by adopting the Gandhian way and emphasise decentralization of power and economy and in consequence emphasise small scale and cottage industry or would the introduction of large scale industry and fairly good centralization of power be more effective? Would the introduction of science and technology be more helpful in removing social and economic injustice and building up scientific temper? These were some of the hard decisions that had to be taken. The frame of reference under which the Government had to do so had by now changed. The Government had to take into consideration not only the views of various schools of thought in the country but also the large scale changes that were taking place the world over. The major powers of the world were taking long strides in industry, technology and science. The impact of these forces was tremendously changing man's outlook with regard to time and space and also with regard to "standard of life". The developed countries were progressing at a very high speed and if the developing countries were to progress they had to work hard even for maintaining the present rate of difference and if they thought of achieving some semblance of equality with the developed countries, time and technological know how were most important considerations. Many countries other than the developed were fast modernizing themselves. One of the weakest points in India's life has been not to observe properly what is going on outside the country particularly with reference to defence preparedness. India could dare to be indifferent to this aspect only at the risk of losing freedom once again. The question, therefore, was not that India should cultivate science and technology and modernize

itself but how soon should she do so. This and other allied questions seemed to have but only one answer. India must go in for a process of modernization. In consequence the gigantic effort to set up a net work of science laboratories, heavy industries on a planned basis was begun.

This in effect meant the acceptance of western methods and techniques for achieving objectives which were drawn from and based on Indian culture. The conflict in values in India therefore, is the conflict between ends and means. We have adopted the means of one culture pattern to achieve the objectives of another.

The Shift In Values

In the preceding chapter we examined the various strains of thought in the background of which decisions had to be taken in the post-independence period. It did not at all take any serious effort to take the kind of decisions that were. The Government, as it was constituted now was prove to many more influences than that of the Indian National Congress. These emanated from economists, scientists, and politicians, administrators, intellectuals, educators and others.

The approaches like those of religionists or of revivalists were summarily ruled out. The main points of view therefore, that were to be considered were those of the progressives and the intellectuals. The death of Gandhi removed from the field a very potential influence which could successfully have advocated the reformed traditional point of view. The field was, therefore, open to the intellectuals to adopt such approaches, policies and techniques as they thought fit. They accepted Gandhian approach at a certain ideological level but in effect they felt that Gandhian approach to solving problems would not prove suitable in the contemporary world. Inevitably therefore they adopted their own.

What is important is not the kind of decisions taken but the background under which this was done. This background was provided by the socio-economic theories and philosophy of the west and not those of India. This approach was strengthened by the easy and immediate availability of tools, techniques and methods developed by the various countries of the west particularly the USA, USSR, and others. For instance

India decided to adopt planning as an approach to solve its various socio-economic problems. Its model, tools, techniques were adopted from the West; not only these, a part of the finances also came from the same sources. How adequate was this approach for the peculiar conditions of India is a different matter; but the attempt that was made did yield results which sufficiently indicate the pattern of its success or failure or the nature of new problems it began to create. Let us have a birds eye view of the successes achieved or the problems faced.

The country made considerable progress in many fields. In the field of education for instance, there has been phenomenal rise in the number of students who now attend school and colleges.

The number of primary schools rose from 209671 in 1950-51 to 377106 in 1963-64. The number of middle schools from 19596 to 65588 and that of High and Higher Secondary Schools from 7288 to 22296. The number of total institutions including schools, colleges, special schools etc., rose from 286860 to 691986. The numbers of universities rose from 27 in 1950-51 to 74 in 1969.

The percentage of pupils in age group 6-11 rose from 43.6% in 1951 to 76.5% in 1966; that of 11 to 14 years from the 12.6% in 1950-51 to 30.30% in 1965-66 and that of students in secondary schools from 5.6 percent in 1950-51 to 17 percent in 1965-66. The number of students receiving higher education increased from 4,03519 in 1951 to 17,59,00 in 1969. The number of primary school teachers rose from 537918 in 1950-51 to 1005846 in 1967-68, that of middle school teachers from 85496 in 1950-51 to 550940 in 1967-68 that high schools teachers from 126504 in 1950-51 to 290333 in 1967-68, and that of higher education from 24,453 in 1950-51 to 1,29,710 in 1965-66.

It is obvious that this very large expansion of educational facilities meant a corresponding rise in expenditure on education. Per capita expenditure on education consequently rose from 3.2 in 1950-51 to 14.6 percent in 1967-68.

Mother tongue was introduced as the medium of instruction at all stages of school education. It is gradually being introduced at the college stage. All attempts are being made to improve the quality of teacher and the quality of Education. One of the steps in this direction was that the Ministry of Education established the National Council of Educational Research and Training with the special responsibility of improving school education. The Council has done considerable speedy work in improving methods of education, introducing a spirit of innovation and experimentation through its various departments. It has a special programme of locating and encouraging science talent and of improving science education at school stage throughout the country. It also has a programme of publishing new text books based on a wide study of books the world over as well as on the curriculum experimentally developed.

Long strides have been taken for developing mass communication through broadcasting and other means of communications. The country is covered by both medium wave and short wave transmitters. There were about 9282349 broad cast receiver licences in force on 31st December, 1968. Television was introduced in Delhi on September, 1959. The service is available to the viewers within a range of 60 kilometers. According to the Thirtieth Annual Report of Registrar of Newspapers in India released in 1969, there were 10019 newspapers and periodicals in existence in December, 1968 as against 9315 in 1967. The circulation of newspapers and periodicals in 1968 was 234.57 lacs. Equally close attention was paid to the maintenance and promotion of art and culture. India indeed has long roots in these. In tune with the new approach, the Government began to institutionalize them. A number of Institutions, like Lalit Kala Akademic, Sangeet Natak Akademic, Sahitya Akademic and Indian Council for Cultural Relations were set up.

The cumulative effect of number of factors led to longer expectancy of life. Life expectancy increased from 32 years in 1941 to 42 years in 1961. The birth rate increased to 42 percent per thousand per annum and a death rate reduced to 23.

per thousand giving a national increase of 19 percent per thousand per annum.

Progress, however in the field of agriculture has been singularly outstanding. We have all along depend upon nature in regard to our agricultural production. So long as we depended on these factors we faced many cruel famines when thousands of people famished for want of food and died of starvation or suffered many physical and mental diseases. For years we had to depend on foreign aid and had to import millions of tones of grains from various countries of the world. But now it has been possible to turn the corner. During the period 1950 to 1965 about 55 lacs hectors were brought under cultivation. In 1967-68 a record food grain 9'56 crore tones was harvested. We are now having better and more crops year after year and we hope to be self sufficient in the near future.

In the field of Science and scientific research the Government made a policy statement on March 31st, 1958 and set up the Council of Scientific and Cultural Research and a large network of national laboratories.

Industrial policy of India, envisaging a mixed economy was first announced in 1948. This was revised and given a socialist pattern in 1956. This revision laid down three categories of industries, one which would be owned and run by the State, two which would be progressively State owned and three which would be owned and run by the private sector. The first two categories known as schedule A and B industries are of fundamental importance to the State. They include industries like steel and iron, defence equipment ; atomic energy, heavy electricals and minerals etc. According to 1965 survey there were 13459 registered factories. About 40 lakh workers work in these factories. The general index of industrial production increased from 54'8 to 160'5 accepting 1960 as the base.

We have made considerable progress and are now recognized as one of the fairly developed industrial countries of the world. We are progressively becoming self-sufficient in many industries.

This is evident from the fact that our ability to purchase stores from our own concerns has progressively increased. The purchases during the Third Plan totalling Rs. 2,166 crores contained 18 percent import stores against an average of 41 and 24 percent during the first and second plans respectively.¹ We have even begun exporting some of the engineering goods.

Along with the development of large scale industry, attention was also paid to the development of small scale and cottage industry. The Central Government set up the Central Small Industries Organisation. By 1967-68 there were 1.20 lakh units and about two crore workers work in them.

It is apparent that we have registered progress in many fields and it is very likely that we shall continue this progress in the years to come. What however, we are examining here, is not only the progress we have achieved but also the fundamental question of progress towards what ?

Let us examine some of the dominant trends that this gigantic effort has produced.

In the field of education millions of boys and girls have been educated. We have produced highly qualified, talented scientists, medical men, engineers, teachers and others. In fact we are not able to hold all of them. But what is the difference education has made to the quality of man ? Are the educated better men and women than the uneducated ? Are they more selfless and less selfish; more generous and less greedy; more humane and less brutal ; more merciful and less revengeful ; more graceful and less crude, more cooperative and less competitive and so on. We dare not answer these questions to ourselves for we have no courage, at present, to stand before the mirror.

We have made a still more vigorous effort to improve our material welfare. How is this improving our life ? Our per capita income, we are told, has increased by about 4.3% per

1. India, 1969 ; Government of India P. 311, 321.

annum. Generally there is more money in circulation. We are fast developing a pattern of society where most of the time and effort of man is utilized in earning or collecting means of livelihood. This is so not only for those who are virtually poor or unemployed, but also for those who have and much more so for those who have in abundance. This emphasis on material welfare is creating a new set of values amongst all, the business man, the engineer, the doctor, the administrator or the teacher. Each of these professions utilize the available human knowledge and intelligence and wit to improve the material position. The business magnates, for instance, utilise scientists, sociologists and psychologists to find the most efficient ways and means of exploiting both the 'haves' and the 'have-nots' through very highly developed methods of advertisement and motivated research techniques. The scientific method is used not only to promote this induced business but also the other one, known as the blackmarket. Competent administrators, sociologists and psychologists are employed to find the most sure and efficient methods of developing successful blackmarketing.

One of the most significant aspects of this way of life is that black marketeers are at their blackest in things and commodities which are essential for human consumption drugs for the sick. (food and clothes for all)

Progress, therefore began to be measured not in terms of quality of life, but standard of material position. So about other profession. This, therefore, has become the main motive or incentive for work or behaviour. And if material good is the objective there is no place for "service" to the other man. This has been brought out by Shri Jai Prakash Narain very clearly. He says "If a man and his consciousness and the society and culture which he has built up are manifestation of matter—howsoever dialectically active—why should anyone in such a society try to be good, generous, kind, unselfish? Why should we have sympathy for those who are weak, poor or sick? So what incentives can there be for moral behaviour. Consequently it is becoming more and more difficult for a person to be selfless or generous or kind or to have a sympathy for the weak,

the poor or the sick."¹ Those, however, who believe in the new material value argue that a philosophy like this is bound to flounder at the rock of human nature. They argue that human behaviour can function better either by developing good civic sense or by providing incentives for better work. Since developing good civic sense is comparatively difficult, providing incentive has become the rewarding slogan. One incentive needs to be supplemented by another and the process goes on. The problem that eventually assumes importance is not the work, but the incentive. "The call for self-denial and self-sacrifice therefore, loses meaning. They are now known as the products of "culture of poverty and scarcity," not of the normal human behaviour.

We have for the last several years been worried about several fissiparous and reactionary tendencies like communalism, casteism, provincialism and religionism. We have been talking about emotional integration and national integration. We have been trying to identify the causes of these disturbing tendencies. There are many causes that lead to these. One of the most fundamental and one which we seem to feel shy to focus attention on is this new philosophy. In some way it is breaking down barriers of caste and creed and religion, in another it is stabilizing and strengthening them and thus laying disastrous seeds of separatism. For instance, my religion is important to me, not because I necessarily believe in it or that I try to purify my life on the basis of it, but because it holds a better material promise to me and to my co-religionists. Similarly, the value pattern that I have accepted now offers new meaning to my community or my State. I raise the slogan for my State because I feel that by doing so I and the other members of my State will get more benefits. In comparison I fear I may not get such benefits from a far-fetched idea of national economy. We have become conscious of these narrow loyalties and are trying to combat them. We are now spending vast amounts of money

1. Planning for Democracy. A.B. Shah, P. 39.

in holding various kinds of programmes for the school and college students by giving them opportunities of living together and for interchange of views. Similarly we ask people of different religions to live together and shed away "unfounded fears." We encourage them to celebrate each others festivals and hope they will thus be able to overcome a real material attraction. These are attempts at curing the symptoms and not the disease. These measures are good and may be continued but they are not going to solve the problem so long as the basic problem of values is not defined and faced. The students and teachers, young and old, Hindus and Muslims, may live together for some days, participate in various functions, discuss national problems and even arrive at some solutions. But the material gains that are the likely to accrue to each one by belonging to a particular group will always prove more attractive than fine intellectual exercises and tasteful lunches, dinners and worth while but seasonal friendships.

We have, no doubt, a massive programme of industrialization, but thankfully, we have not been able to go all out for it. And so we have not yet felt the need to exploit nature as fully as we may. Nevertheless, our incursions into the innocent nature has begun to yield fruit. Competent authorities have warned us that our industrial towns have begun to pollute water and air and this is creating hazards for our health.

We had during the centuries gone by, built a society which had been in harmony with man, nature and time. It built a pattern of life which did not expose man to strain and stress or tension. In fact it produced, as has rightly been pointed out a "psychological safety valve," where those threatened with tension could retreat. But the pattern that we are developing now, is developing strain, tension, neurosis and crime. We do feel aghast at the frequency and nature of crime we have begun to read about. We are told that crime is on the increase. The growth in crime is overstepping the increase in population; while the population increased by 24.3 percent between 1960 and 1969, the index of crime rose by 39.4 percent. During the last five years 1963-68, the number of cognizable offences increased

from 658, 830 to 861, 962, and that of murders from 10075 to 13849—a 30 percent increase¹.

This discussion helps to understand that our decision during the post-independence period marked a shift from the way of life and philosophy of the pre-independence period. It also indicates the various ways in which the country has progressed and the new value pattern it is developing. There are some who visualize a new India emerging as a result of this shift in philosophy. There are others who feel dismayed. They had hoped that India would not prove to be "Just one more nation", but one new nation with a new refreshing message. Had not Shri Aurobindo the great saint seen the danger and given the warning? In a message to the Andhra University in 1948, just a year after achieving independence he had said "There are deeper issues for India herself, since by following certain tempting direction she may conceivably become a nation like many others evolving an opulent industry and commerce, a powerful organisation of social and political life, an immense military strength, practising powerpolitics with a high degree of success, guarding and extending zealously her gains and her interests, dominating even a larger part of the world, but in this apparently magnificent progression forfeiting its Swadharma, losing her soul. Then ancient India and her spirit might disappear altogether and we would only have one more nation like the others and that would be a real gain neither to the world nor to us. There is a question whether she may prosper more harmlessly in the outward life yet lose altogether her richly massed and firmly held spiritual experience and knowledge. It would be a tragic irony of fate if India were to throw away her spiritual heritage at the very moment when in the rest of the world there is more and more turning towards her for spiritual help and a saving-light." Mr. Andre Roussau makes the following comments on this message. "A warning like this holds good for other peoples and other civilizations of the East. And the last words of the

1. Sunday Standard 10th October, 1971.

The Hindustan Times November 5, 1971.

quotation show the healthy current which is stirring now-a-days from India first of all, but also from the whole East, towards Western minds—not merely the tide of erudition on which the science of the Orientalists has to live long, but a current of active philosophy, propitious to fruitful intercourse leading to common spiritual progress." And so we are creating. "One more nation like the others." We are repeating the experience of the west in India. We have begun to pass through all the stages that man in the west has passed and create the affluence and the "sickness" which the west is suffering from today.

We are now in the early stages of a new life. Much more is to follow. We can infer the nature of things to follow, if we just turn to see what is happening in the West.

Man there has developed destructive weapons of war ; so may we. He has exploited nature recklessly, so may we ; he has set his foot on moon, so may we ; he has grown rich and has all the amenities that he could look for and so may we. And in all this affluence, he has developed a "sickness" and a purposelessness and so may we, unless we wish and try to be different. If we do, we shall have to ask ourselves ; what is it that has brought this sickness to the west. One of the most significant reasons that has been responsible for this is the trust that the west has placed in what is known as the naturelistic theory of value. Under this theory, human values are derived from and ultimately reduced to biological needs, drives and principles. Biological values are essentially maintenance of the individual, survival of the group and evolution of species. Consequently pleasure, pain, goodness, truth and beauty become questions of needs and urges and satisfactions at the biological and physiological level. "Generalising the original physiological meaning of homeostasis the terms of psychological and sociological homeostasis were introduced ; that is the ultimate goal of behaviour is to maintain the psychophysical organism in a biological, psychological and

-
1. Problems and issues in Contemporary Education—P. 247.
An Anthology from the Harvard Educational Review and the Teachers College Record P. 247. Scott, Foresman & Company.

social equilibrium." This is turned to the philosophy of "conformity and the ideology of so called progressive education, both proclaiming social adjustments or equilibrium with existing society as the ultimate goal¹. Such a philosophy indeed is pleasant because it limits your efforts to immediate pleasure or the maintenance of social adjustments or equilibrium with the existing society and saves the inconvenience and tribulations of struggling for a distant ideological abstraction. The appeal, therefore, of immediate satisfaction of urges and drives is much more quickly acceptable than the unverifiable distant abstractions. Consequently achieving immediate gains in business, service, sex, human relations, public administration or in other fields have, become acceptable values. This has created a pattern of society where man has all the ease and luxury that he needs and yet neurosis, strain, stress, tension and crime is on the increase. Prof. Ludwig Von Bertalanffy has succinctly described this. He says, "Ours is the affluent society, so we read, and we have the highest standard of life ever achieved.... Economic opulence goes hand in hand with the peak of mental illness, some 50% of hospital beds being occupied by mental patients. It goes hand in hand with a continuous increase in the rate of crime especially juvenile delinquency. And the psychotherapists tell us, beside the classical neurosis caused by stress, tensions and psychological trauma, a new type of mental sickness has developed for which they have even had to coin a new term—existential neurosis, mental illness arising from the meaninglessness of life, the lack of goals and hopes in a mechanized mass society. We have conquered the world, but somewhere on the way, we seem to have lost our soul."²

Therefore the philosophers as well as scientists ardently ask : "Why has life become devoid of meaning and goals at a time of affluence and high standard whereas it apparently has meaning and goals in times comparatively poorer in their economic and technical resources ?" The answer which the eminent biologist Mr. Ludwig gives is, "The diagnosis of the sick society,

1. Ibid page 247.

2. Ibid page 245-46.

then, is quite simply that it provides more or less abundantly for the biological needs but straves the spiritual ones."

This is the kind of future that awaits us. The value pattern we have adopted is self-generating. It is argued that there is no point of return in the age of 'science and technology : You have to go ahead, creating more problems, suffer multitudes of humanity through them, and try to solve them through the life and blood of innocent millions. This may indeed be so for those who have submitted to the machine and cannot think of an alternative approach to life.

Fortunately we are an ancient people with a long memory. It continues to question our new value pattern and our new assumptions. It continually asks us to examine whether the frame of reference we now work under is conducive to our growth and to the value pattern we now have or would like to have. Our heritage, therefore, is a perennial reminder of the vital question. "Is this the way of life most suited or us ?" In the light of the experience we have begun to have in our own country or that of west, should we persist in cultivating the new slant in our way of life ? Or should we find an alternative where the quality and not the comforts of life are more urgent ?

Chapter 3

The Social Value Pattern and the Freedom of Teacher

The traditionalists trace the fall of teacher in India to the time of Mahabharata when Dronacharya, the great teacher of Kauravas and Pandavas agreed to teach the royal princes at the royal palace and did not require them to come to his own home to receive education. This is said to be the first instance where the Guru came under the influence of the royalty and went to teach students at their own residence instead calling them to his own. In this connection it may be recalled that the earlier practice was to send the child to Guru's house for education. Shri Rama was not educated at his own house but was sent to the house of the Guru, Rishi Vashishtha and he learned at the feet of his master in the forest. Even during Mahabharata times Shri Krishana and Sudhama were required to go to the house of their teacher and learn there. But the departure was made by the Kaurava and Pandva family. They influenced the teacher to come to the royal palace and teach their children there.

However, the teacher in ancient and medieval time was generally independent of governmental pressure and interference. He developed his own curriculum, syllabus, methods of teaching and evaluation. He declared his students eligible or not eligible for the next course and neither the society nor the Government interfered with his judgement at any time. Education was entirely the responsibility of the community. The present system under which education has become the responsibility of the state and the teacher has become a government servant or a servant of an educational organisation and has ceased to be an independent entity, is a concept which we learnt under western influence.

Under this method, as stated above, education ceased to be a major responsibility of the community and became a responsibility of the Government and the teacher a servant who has to carry out the policies laid down by the State Government.

The freedom that the teacher or the intellectual enjoyed then was unique. He was absolutely free from any external influence or pressure. If he had any restrictions, these were the restrictions of the discipline or the restrictions imposed by the character of the society. In fact, some assert that the extent of this freedom was very large. As a proof of this they cite examples of a large number of schools of thought that developed in India during the centuries. They argue that the growth of a very large number of such schools of thought could not have been possible in the absence of full freedom of thought. There is, however, another school of thought which says that there has not been any freedom of thought at all. For instance¹, Mr. A.B. Shah asserts, "India's cultural heritage is not favourable to free and responsible thought. The growth of a tradition of civic concern and participation was not possible in a caste ridden society dominated by an other-worldly outlook. The pre-eminent role assigned to religion encouraged reliance on authority and made a fetish of simple living and unrestrained speculation. This, combined with a rigidly hierarchical social structure, in which the station of the individual and indeed the entire course of his life were determined by birth, led to a withdrawal of interest from secular affairs beyond one's own concern... The empirical observation of the Hindu, fine as it was, was not fertilized by his well known gift for subtle and and imaginative thought. Consequently, unlike Greek philosophy Hindu philosophy and social thought could not break through their magico-religious shell. The immobility of the Hindu social structure and the privileged, indeed the monopolist position of the intellectual elite ruled out for centuries pressure from below or an urge from above for a fundamental rethinking in the secular sphere. The result has been curious. The Hindu mind can

(1) *Planning for Democracy* by A. B. Shah. p. 50.

tolerate, and sometimes even admire, considerable deviation in the realm of pure thought, provided there is no insistence on relating thought to action on the mundane plane."

The tendency of the Indian to indulge in free thought wherein it would remain an intellectual exercise without any commitment for its conversion into action, has by some scholars been traced to the dichotomy of the Indian mind. As stated above the Indian and particularly the Hindu achieved high level in theoretical thinking but he has not always been able to translate the thought to action on the mundane plane. The result has been that the Indian has lived in two worlds simultaneously. The Hindu believes in the universality of human spirit and yet could divide his community into several divisions of high and low caste. He could aspire for spiritual heights and at the same time be vulgarly materialistic in outlook. He could cultivate and glorify knowledge at one level and deny it to others at another. He could worship Goddess Saraswati i. e. the Goddess of learning and simultaneously pay obeisance to Goddess Lakshmi i.e. Goddess of wealth. He could easily adopt double standards of dress and have one at the office and another at home. To him truth and untruth exist simultaneously and do not create any tension in his mind. He would with ease go to a temple and offer prayers and simultaneously indulge in the blackest black-market that he could. He would generously donate for the building of temples or gurdawars and simultaneously not hesitate in acquiring money through wrong channels. This dichotomy is not limited to the common man. Even men of science who teach and profess rational and scientific attitude inwardly believe in astrology. Men at all stages do not find any contradiction in simultaneously calling in a doctor to treat a patient and a soothsayer as well, and so on. If we apply this to the field of education, we could say that the Indian teacher is not averse to if he is not enthusiastic about innovations and progressive ideas about educational theory and practice. In most cases he is perfectly at ease in understanding or explaining educational theories, concepts and innovations but when he goes to practising them in the classroom

situations, he is different.

The dichotomy of thought, it may be said, is not peculiar to the Indian. It is a phenomena which is true of man anywhere in the world. If we, for instance, examine the western modes of thought and behaviour we find a similar dichotomy there. Christian morality and charity, for instance, are some of the noblest features of christian faith and yet the attitude of western Christian towards his neighbour has been that of uncharity and even cruelty. Christians of the west went abroad, conquered, humiliated and ex-terminated some other peoples and cultures. England practiced democracy at home but imperialism abroad. The west believed in and professed equality of man but presents a miserable scene of class wars. Equality of women is another noble feature of the Christian faith and yet the Christians never gave an equal status to women. Even now women do not enjoy equality of status in many countries of the West. Another significant example in this regard is the apartheid which is being practised by the white Christian in Africa. He is not prepared to recognise man as equal to man. The European politicians and even scholars who decided and looked down upon the caste system in India have been and are upholding and assisting the continuation of the "apartheid" in Africa and "blacks" in America.

Whilst, therefore, it is true that dichotomy is a universal phenomena of the human mind, the nature of dichotomy signifies the cultural differences. In India it led to a sense of toleration amounting to indifference because the Indian saw both truth and untruth side by side ; it led the west to assertiveness and aggression. It saw the truth and could not tolerate the untruth. Whilst, therefore the Indian saw truth in his own religion or social philosophy, it did not deny it to others, the western saw truth in his own religion, his economic or political philosophy and in no other. In consequence there have been no religious persecutions, no class wars, no colonial wars in India, as there have been in the west.

There is truth in both these major view points. There,

indeed was in India unequalled freedom to the thinkers belonging to a particular social group. But it is also true that the total social structure was not such as guaranteed equality of status or position or opportunity to all with the result that those who were outside a particular social group did not enjoy as much of freedom as did the members of a different social group. For instance, the Brahmins or Kashtriyas enjoyed this freedom, while the Vaishyas and Shudras did not. This, however, is not a hard and fast division. Some of the masterpieces of Indian thought and literature have come, not from Brahmins, but from non Brahmins. Vishwamitra was not a Brahmin, nor were all the Charvakas. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that freedom of thought and action was not a universal phenomena. The absence, however, of freedom of thought was due, not to lack of the recognition of the importance of freedom of thought for it was given to one section of society but to the political and social character of the society.

Freedom does not emerge from vacuum. It is the product of a number of social, economic and other factors that a community has developed for itself. They change from age to age. In ancient times generally these forces were comparatively simple. Today they are much more complex. The concept of freedom also changes with times. Freedom, as we conceive today, is very different from the freedom that ancients thought of or enjoyed.

In the pre-industrial era in England or America and now in India, we find that freedom of thought and expression was influenced by a set of principles which operated during the period. For instance, when the economy and social structure of the British or the American people was mainly based on agriculture and business, man was relatively himself. He thought and felt and acted as an individual and took decisions accordingly. He did not feel the necessity of taking shelter under the collective security provided by the unions of farmers or labourers or capitalists. But we have now created a pattern of society where we theoretically accept the individual as free, unique and supreme and yet in practice we find that the individual has lost faith in himself and in his capacity to influence others. He has invariably

to take shelter under certain institutional authorities. The capitalist, for instance, feels safe in his own guilds and uses it to bring about successful pressures on the various social and administrative groups to get such laws or by-laws passed as do good to him. Similarly a labourer feels helpless in asserting his rights from the capitalist claws. He has, therefore, surrendered himself to labour unions. This gives him the power to bargain against the capitalist interest. So about the government or private employees. We have thus created a socio-economic pattern of society in which this has become inevitable. It, no doubt, is proving useful to members but regretfully we must accept that it is standardising man rather than giving him the uniqueness which is his. The process is strengthened by the powerful media of mass communication like radio, television, newspapers, etc. which constantly inform the masses but simultaneously circumscribe their creativity and free thinking.

The pattern of society that we are developing now is not conducive to freedom of thought. Today we value reason and intellect, science and technology because they promise material affluence; we pattern the social relationships in a way that helps us further material interests; we organise our social structure so that we can have bargaining power, not necessarily the power of the truth of the cause. In fact we pattern everything with a view to further our material welfare. Under this form of social order what we value most is not the individual in his fullness, but the individual in relation to his material ease or hardship.

We have no reason to suspect the intellectual capacity of the intellectual or the teacher. Most assuredly he understands the overriding importance of freedom and creativity and the need to cultivate it and practice it. In effect he does not do it either in the classroom or outside. He has not been asserting his view point in regard to educational issues. Except on rare occasions, we do not find any confrontation of ideas between the educationists and other elements of society like the administrators or politicians. The educators have all along thought it

wiser to 'agree' with the better wisdom of the administrator. That he has been behaving so, is not an enigma at all. The intellectual is shrewd enough to know that what the society respects is his material position and his capacity to do good or harm to others and not his gentle informed opinions and views. Why then should he risk his power and position in favour of a dubious freedom of thought? Why should he have a passion for truth, liberty and goodness when they do not hold any meaning to the society?

Again, as stated earlier, the teacher is no longer himself, he is a servant and is expected to carry out the ideas or the policy fixed by the government. His freedom is determined by what his government lays down for him. The Government has established a strong and all powerful machinery called the Department of Education to enforce what it lays down. The concept that the teacher is Guru, a seer, a creator, a free-thinker and a builder of the society, has been replaced by a concept of the teacher who should be told what the Department wants, supervised and made to carry out what he has been told. The administrator consequently is authoritative in nature and dispensation. It is the administrative head who matters and lays down the policy and the philosophy and not the academician or the teacher. The persons who are important, therefore, are the Directors of Education, the Principals of Colleges and Headmasters of schools and not the teachers of schools or the lecturers of colleges. How then can teaching in schools and colleges be directed towards enabling students to think and express freely. Naturally the inevitable follows.

Teachers do what the departmental officers want them to do. As Inspector of schools for some time, I have often heard teachers say "We shall do as you direct, and so far we used to do what the ex-inspector wanted us to do." They are required to complete the syllabus and prepare students for getting through the examination. They do this faithfully and this is what pays them. To help the students, to develop the ability to think critically to weigh the pros and cons of a problem, and to help them

experiment with new ideas in art, literature, science is not relevant to their needs and values.

It is a sad irony that most of our schools have a full democratic apparatus a *bal sabha*, a school parliament, a school discipline council, a debating society and the rest of it—but not the democratic spirit. The objective in organising these and other activities is to offer opportunities to students to practice democracy and to weigh and judge matters and act accordingly. But in reality very few schools and colleges transfer real authority to the students. The administrators there inwardly believe that students can not take correct decisions independently and therefore, they should work under supervision which means that they should do what the teachers consider correct. These instruments consequently are used not to develop the spirit of democracy or of taking decisions on the basis of correct judgement but instruments which give practical demonstration of hypocrisy of the teacher. In the classroom the teacher encourages dependence on “notes” or “guides”. We are all very familiar with the way in which the “composition” as a form of “creative writing” is taught to our students. The teacher dictates and the students write. The present writer has visited large number of schools throughout the country and has been depressed to see the method used in most schools. This is so not only in the classroom, but also in the debating or recitation club. Here again it is the teacher who gives the theme for a drama or a passage for recitation; it is he who gives a topic for discussion and dictate the speech to the students to be “delivered” by him in the so-called debating competition; it is he who writes for him for the school magazines. The entire effort is a contradiction in terms. We are out to release creativity and encourage freedom of thinking and we end in killing both, for does this process not amount to virtually asking students, not to think and depend upon the thinking done by others, the teacher, the private coach or the parents ?

What about colleges and universities ? Are the teachers there different from what they are in schools ? Do the procedures

and methods they use encourage creativity and the thinking ? Do our teacher training schools and colleges provide the necessary atmosphere, education and training to teachers so as to enable them to teach their students in a way that they learn how to encourage creativity and freedom amongst the students when they go back to their schools ?

We hardly need to discuss this in detail. The majority of our teachers in colleges and universities, like their counterparts in primary and secondary schools, dictate and read their, "Once-upon-a-time" prepared notes before the students.

What is the stuff that our schools, colleges, and universities produce ? We very well know the answer to this question. We have not succeeded in teaching them to think, to weigh, to discriminate, to differ, to decide, to create. We, therefore, cannot hope to produce students who can think and create. The worst is that we feel annoyed and disturbed when we see the fruit of our labourstudents acting and behaving unthinkingly, uncreatively and slavishly.

What about research workers, research themes and research methods ? Do our professors of research encourage their students to conduct research in an original and creative manner ? Do the professors conduct research and guide students the way they would like to ? The best answer to these irritable questions is not to argue this way or that but to see the end result we have achieved. Have our professors and teachers been able to find a new school of thought or a variation of an existing thought in any field-philosophy, psychology, methods of teaching, examination ? Have they or their students developed a new technique, a new method of conducting research ? Have they put forth a practical solution to any of our educational problem at the state or national level ? How many of them have to say anything worthwhile on the basis of their first hand experience in relation to educational experimentation and innovation ? Today our base is broad enough. We have more than 70 universities and 350 Teacher Training Colleges

and 1200 Training schools and yet our poverty of original and creative thinking and behaviour is so appallingly low.

We have tried to indicate that today we enjoy freedom of thought to the extent that the pattern of society we have developed, permits. We are not happy with what we are able to achieve with this freedom. Our students, teachers, professors, research workers and others are not able to give the best they can. We need to enjoy this freedom more effectively and we need a more comprehensive concept of freedom. Our attempt to build our society on the model of the socio-economic pattern of the west is not proving useful; its emphasis on material affluence rather than on human individual and the consequent systems of philosophies are going right against our basic needs, requirements and values.

Fortunately we are alive to such periods of our history when we were comparatively freer and more creative. Fortunately also we are now politically free. We are aware of the western and eastern concept of freedom and are, therefore, in a position to look at these from a distance and a comparatively detached mind. We inherit wisdom of our ancestors on the one hand and on the other we are aware of the scientific and industrial spirit of the modern age. It is clear that neither the ancient thought nor modern science has proved conducive to freedom of thought and action in India or the world. Today we are very proud of democracy but is the concept, as we understand today, adequate? Democracy is a great principle primarily because it promises freedom to the individual and accepts him as unique. But in practice democracy does not allow you to go beyond democracy. From this point of view the freedom that it offers, is no better than the freedom that communism offers to a communist. A communist is free within the circumference of communism; so also is a democrat free within the circumference of democracy. Both cannot think beyond democracy or beyond communism. From an essentially Indian point of view both these concepts are strictly limited. The human thought is greater than both democracy and communism.

Our freedom is in peril, not because we do not know the truth, but because we "know" it.

Fortunately the concept of truth in India is all comprehensive. Our saints and seers have through the ages tried to find it, describe it, define it, but they have not been able to do so. But we seem to know the truth and therefore, we are in confusion. We need to overcome this confusion. If we want to have the freedom, we need to build a society where the intellect and reason are important but not the stupid end of human greatness; where technology and science are necessary, but do not dominate man and his environment; where power and wealth are necessary, but not the be all and end all; and where all these are governed by a pattern of values which do not render man a servant of his creation but uphold his uniqueness as an individual; a place where, in the true Indian tradition, truth is not what you know but what you strive to know. Freedom has justification not when you have reached the goal but when you strive for it. Teacher will be free, not when the truth is given to him, but when he is out in search of it.

Moral Education And The School

The question of imparting moral education to students has been attracting the attention of teachers, parents and the country for a long time. All are agreed on the need and importance of imparting this education to them. State Governments and educationists have been thinking of doing some systematic work and have made attempts to develop what is called a common syllabus for moral education. India being a secular state, all kinds of apprehensions are raised in regard to preparing such a syllabus. One such apprehension is that the ideology of one religion should not dominate over others and that there should be a balanced representation of the different views in preparing this curriculum. The other approach is to make the syllabus ethical rather than religious. These considerations, however, are obsolete today. The fast changing conditions the world over including our own country, have thrown out a new complex of ideas and values. And the question of moral education would have to be considered from this wider perspective.

India is an old country with a very rich culture. This culture has shown the distinct intensity of its outlook at different periods. The present is one such period. Some of the most significant features of this period have been the attention the country has paid to education, science, technology, industry and agriculture and the influence it is bearing on the different aspects of its life. Education has spread at an unprecedented speed and magnitude and its liberating influences have begun to trickle down to lakhs of people to whom education was a stranger for centuries. Hundreds of thousands of children are now rushing to schools, colleges and universities, breaking the

dark tradition of thousands of years and entering a new world of light, hope and freedom.

The progress and achievements of science are influencing man all over the world including India, giving new direction to his thought and behaviour. It has succeeded in reducing human sickness, misery, poverty, ignorance and superstition. It is helping in lightening man's burden, his drudgery and making life more enjoyable. It is enabling him to step out of this small earth and fly into the infinite space outside. Man has already set his foot on the Moon and is soon expecting to peep into the secrets of other planets. This fantastic fiction is more than true. These activities of science are fast exploding some of the cherished ideas and values of man.

Science, however, is not all that good. It seems to be a helpless heap of energy in the hands of the Satan in man. Whilst it is being used for betterment of man, it is also being used for his destruction. It offers one of the rare examples of how the creative genius of man can be mis-used for his destruction. Nevertheless, what forbids man from destroying himself is, most naturally, science again. For it urges him to come out of not only superstition but also irrationalism and depend more and more on human intellect and its rationalism. The result is that authority is no longer authority on the basis of authority. What is true and good, is no longer so because tradition says it or the age accepts it. You may accept it if you can test and verify it on the altar of rationalism. Nothing is true or good or beautiful unless you question it, test it, and verify that it is so.

Science is producing changes in human thinking and behaviour in yet another form, through industry and technology. It has succeeded in giving man such material facilities as he had never enjoyed ever since his history began on earth.

"Spiritual *versus* material" has been an age-old controversy in this country. But it has taken a new dimension with the development of industry, technology and agriculture. In

fact, spiritual welfare is losing some of those connotations which placed it in juxtaposition of material welfare. It is no longer "either spiritual or material". The new faith is that spiritual and material can and must fuse. In fact, this is exactly what the living seer of India, Vinobaji is saying. This, however, is a long hope. We have yet to see how this could be thought of and brought about. Immediately, material welfare is overshadowing spiritual welfare. It has converted the traditionally honest trader into the blackest of black marketeers, the teacher and the physician into a mercenary, the engineer and the administrator into ruthless "super mercenaries". The criterion of human greatness and goodness is not how true, honest or selfless a man is, but how rich he is. You are great or important to the extent that you can afford a newer set of furniture, newer model of car, a refrigerator, a television set and so on. This in turn could depend upon how crafty you are in amassing wealth or influence, no matter where you are ; in business, administration or profession.

Science is working as the most successful iconoclast of established traditions and values. Most of them are on test; religious fact and fancy; social privilege and taboo; administrative authority and philosophy; as also concept of authority, be it that of priesthood, parenthood or administration, of teacher or professor, of truth or honesty etc.

An aspect of this iconoclastic behaviour is the way it is working on the different age levels. It has produced what is called the process of modernisation. A significant fact of this process is that it was started by a generation which has been brought up on old values and traditions. This generation may have seen a vision of the future but is primarily the product of an older value pattern. It sticks to this pattern though it lives through the change. But the way this transition from a traditional to a modern society is influencing the younger generation is radically different. It lives under the stimulating influences of the achievements of science and technology on the one hand and the corrupting influences of the older generation on the other.

In Europe the new age of science and technology is producing far-reaching changes in the morals of the people. England has seen new values in homosexual life. In Sweden marriage is fast losing its meaning. Love, marriage and fidelity no longer need to go together. New concepts like group marriages, where each man and woman can lead sexual life with every other man or woman in the group and where the off-spring recognizes all the members as parents, are becoming popular. Boys and girls are encouraged to experiment with sex life with a view to help them later to choose a partner "wisely". Sociologists and psychologists have discovered that this has proved useful insofar as it relieves them of social and sexual tensions. Some time back Denmark held a world sex fair, a special exhibit of which was a show of the sex act by persons not necessarily husband and wife. The show proved so popular that plane-loads of visitors went there from all over Europe and America. In America, boys and girls are developing new concepts of common hostel life. Affluence, the fruit of science and technology, is producing a different set of values. One such expression is the cult of Hippies. Another expression is protest against war in Vietnam or against Black Power.

Science, however, is not the only influence which is fast changing the morals of man. Political philosophies and political practices are another powerful force. Each political party has an ideology and when politicians speak, they profess these noble ideologies. This, however, is not important, for one of the easiest things to do is talk of noble ideas and offer advice to people. What, however, is difficult to do is to carry out in one's life the ideals that one professes. Students, shrewd as they are, know this and look for, not to listening to you but seeing you do what you profess. They, therefore, pay attention not to what you say, but to what you do. Politicians, for instance, ask the young to be disciplined and serve the country selflessly and with devotion. But they themselves give unenviable examples of indiscipline, selfishness and lack of devotion to principles. They ask them not to destroy public property or resort to vandalism but they do not hesitate to do so whenever it suits them. They

talk and plead for principles but they personally do not follow them. In schools and colleges, teachers and professors ask students to work hard while they themselves shirk work. They ask the students to be abreast of the latest advances in knowledge while they themselves are content with notes prepared decades ago. The position is no better in homes. In fact, moral education, which should begin in each home, is, in fact, the first casualty just here. The innocent child who told the visitor "Daddy says he is not in" is a classical example of moral education at home.

One of the most telling influences which shapes the concepts about morals is the standards and norms of public and private administration. They have fallen so low that it is the considered view of the common man that anything can be purchased—justice—a job—promotion—a contract—a licence and of course commodities which are "not available." We are now very well aware how some of the best talent in the country could not get appointments in motherland and had to quit the country in disgust. The examining bodies were either incapable of or dishonest in locating this talent. One of the greatest dispirits of many a capable young man today is that he does not have an influential man to speak for him and create the necessary "atmosphere" for his appointment or promotion. It might appear that young men are an angry lot of people, frustrated on account of adult thought and behaviour, corrupt administration and so on. This, however, is not wholly correct. They have developed certain other attitudes for instance, defiance of religion, tradition and so on. The grip of religion on young men today is loose. It is looser still on Hindu students. No longer do they go to temples or observe religious functions, except those that have a social or prestige significance. This, however, is not so true about Christian, Muslim or Sikh students who still observe a Sunday or a Friday religion. But all defy the accepted traditions and forms of dress, hair style or habits of food. A young man today takes pride, not in conforming to age-old tradition or ways of life, but in being a little different. There, however, is a sea of hypocrisy beneath this imposing pose of modernism. I am not sure whether the impact of industry, technology or science is so deep

on our young men and women ; for there is not much in our school curriculum or the atmosphere around which justifies a deep impact on their understanding. They criticise religious principles and practices even though they do not read any religious literature; they criticise elders for their love of power and prestige, but by themselves, they not only do not shun it, but vigorously fight for it ; they want their teachers to be scholarly, but themselves would not read in depth and would agitate against the examiner or the University because the question paper was "difficult". And as soon as they become office-holders of a students' organization, they dispense not good principles or understanding, but good politics.

The authority of parents does not seem to have been eroded to this extent. That perhaps is due to economic poverty. However, the religion image, the teacher image or the father image is yet comparatively in tact.

The heroes of boys and girls generally are not those who have worked for the good of man or of the country, but those who live glamorous lives. This perhaps is due to the fact that the atmosphere around is saturated with their halo. The film, the radio, cheap literature and journals complete the job. It would be an interesting study to see how much time and money the nation spends on making the lives of these glamorous men and women, as well as of thinkers and reformers and others, known to boys and girls, and with what effectiveness. The result is that they know more about the lives and activities of film-stars and the like, than about scientists, poets, thinkers and others. And yet many argue of glamour and affluence are the answer to their problems. The affluence of the west and its influence on the younger generation, particularly on the Hippies and the popular singers, the Beatles and others is revealing. The loose disorganized living, the heavy leaning on drugs, the appalling conditions of a permissive society, the staggering behaviour of sex life, the rejection of the principle of virginity amongst girls or of fidelity amongst men and women and so on are constantly repelling some young men and women and compelling others. The older

generation suffered some conflicts. But their conflicts were simple. The conflicts of the younger generation are more and also more complex and therefore, harder. What are good morals? This is a question very difficult for them to answer. And what is spirituality is a still harder question, for their knowledge about it is, in comparison, far less. The youth thus stands bewildered.

What then are moral values is a difficult question for him to decide. Are honesty, co-operation, justice, fair play, selflessness, fidelity and so on good moral values? Do they pay in actual life to-day? Is it not better to be less honest, less sincere, less co-operative and more selfish, more pleasant, more manageable and less faithful? Which one of these leads to better life and better prospects? The older generation avoided conflict for it had accepted two ways of life; one at home and the other outside home. At home perhaps this generation offers prayers to God or goes to wash off its sins to Gurudwara, temple or church. But many of them are generally disloyal, dishonest, unco-operative, unhelpful in official work or business.

The community and the Government expect that schools should give moral education to children. It is much more important now than it was in the past. This is very true indeed. It is also argued that giving moral education as such is not sufficient but there should be a programme of work which would help in the cultivation of those qualities which are useful for developing proper moral life. A large number of schools, both denominational and non-denominational, have introduced a number of activities for achieving this objective. Some schools offer religious education to students once or twice a week; some hold morning assemblies and have a programme under which the students and teachers give talks on religious or moral topics; some celebrate national festivals; some others, birth-days of great prophets men like Buddha, Mohamad, Nanak, Gandhiji or Nehru. A number of schools organise citizenship programmes under which boys and girls are told to be good citizens and are given opportunities to behave like good citizens. Some schools have introduced what is known as School Parliament and offer the students a

chance to talk about matters as if in a parliament. Some schools have introduced programmes like literary societies, dramatic clubs, art clubs and so on.

It is indeed good that some schools have these programmes. It is also very worthwhile that many more introduce them. The present writer has experience of the working of most of these programmes in quite a number of schools all over the country. The important question is not whether there should or should not be such programmes in schools. There can be no two opinions that these and similar activities ought to be introduced in all schools all over the country. But the important question is, how are these activities conducted? Are the persons involved, both teachers and students, so placed that they can be morally sincere to these activities or are they conducted in a way which may give some satisfaction to those who do them or to those who see them, particularly, the officers of the Directorate of Education or the professors of Universities or the parents?

The sad fact is that at the present moment the necessary atmosphere which would induce teachers and students to carry on these activities in the way they ought to, is missing. The school certainly is an idealised institution but unfortunately it is an epitome of the society as well. [Today neither the society nor the school knows for certain what is moral. The community is perfectly justified in looking up to the school today for support and guidance in regard to this difficult question; for it is the school after all which lays the foundation of the kind of society that a community wants to build. But in reality the fact is that education always has been an instrument in the hands of political and other thinkers of a country. It has usually carried out what the political and other thinkers have laid down for it. This indeed is a tragic situation, but it is true.

[It is, however, different with a pure educationist. An educationist is by nature an optimist, because he believes in the educability of man. He does not feel that it is possible for a human being to traverse from darkness to light and from despair

to hope and that his ultimate destiny is better than what it is now. The responsibility, therefore, of improving man lies with him and not with the politician or any other person. It is, therefore, he who should take the initiative in giving moral education to the child. Teachers and scholars have been and continue to work towards this objective. And some do it with considerable success. Unfortunately, some of the very good work done in schools and colleges is destroyed by adult behaviour in the shop, in office, in the Legislative Assembly and in the Parliament. To talk, therefore, of moral education and to throw the responsibility on the school is as unreal as it could be.

If we are really anxious about having moral education, we will have to do some serious thinking. As discussed above, the concept of moral values has changed and is continuing to undergo change; each generation has its own concept; today the older generation has its own perception and the younger its own. What then are the morals that we would like to teach? Those that are prevalent with the older generation, or the newer generation, or those found in religious literature, political philosophy, educational literature, the fast evolving values as illustrated in the behaviour patterns of politicians, teachers, professors, engineers, businessmen? And again, are we going to teach what are called absolute values like "truth" or "honesty" or be prepared to accept both truth and honesty as relative terms and so on? These are all difficult if not impossible questions to decide. But unless the conflict about what is moral or morality at a particular time is solved or clarified and considered suitable for a particular time and age, it is difficult to teach. A group of eminent teachers—National Awardees—who were in a conference at the National Institute of Education—found it hard to decide what moral education should be given as conceived by adults or as conceived by the younger generation?

We shall also have to be clear with regard to the methods of imparting moral education. The difficulty about this subject is that it is not a mere intellectual exercise or mere understanding.

One may be an intellectual giant or a great scholar and yet a moral wreck. Rousseau, a great intellectual, an educator and writer on moral education, was yet a moral suspect. Moral education involves, in a very fundamental way, both intellectual understanding and behavioural dispensation. It consequently cannot just be taught. It has to be exemplified in order to be taught. Otherwise, one may learn and teach all principles and practices of moral life and yet live an amoral or immoral life. There is also the danger that it may lead to keen intellectual exercise or scholarship in the field without relation to moral behaviour and thus help in producing sound hypocrites but not moral beings.

Assuming, however, that we are clear about what moral education we want to impart, also assuming that we find teachers with requisite qualities, not necessarily qualifications, to impart moral education, what are the dangers that a school is likely to face in achieving its objectives? The school by virtue of being an idealised epitome of the society will assuredly be different from the society it belongs to. What are the likely effects produced on students to the differences between the moral code as taught in the school and as practised by the society? Will the school be able to stand the overriding influences emanating from the behavioural patterns of the society? And if the school is an ivory tower or let us say, a real tower of strength and does protect its students from these influences, will it be able to produce students who can fit in a society, whose beliefs and practices they have not known and lived through? Will such a school not produce misfits than fits?

The question of moral education, as may have been indicated by the above discussion, is closely linked up with the question of the philosophy of the country. Since this is a time when conflicts of a basic nature have clouded a clear perception of values, a clear visualisation and teaching of moral values is not possible. Concepts of moral education can be taught better only when they are perceived and understood. We cannot be clear about moral values if there is confusion in our philosophical outlook.

All progress in fact takes place horizontally, may be with slight variations. Efforts for imparting moral education will succeed in proportion to our norms of progress in other fields of thought and action.

The question of moral education, therefore, has to be thought of, not in terms of moral education of boys and girls, but in terms of the moral regeneration of the whole country. Nothing less than that can succeed.

Chapter 5

Gandhian Values In Education

India is one of the few countries of the world which can boast of an unruffled continuity from times immemorial. It faced various situations and challenges at different periods of life beginning with the coming of the Aryas to the exit of the British. The challenge of the Aryans to the pre-Aryans or that of Muslim to Hindus or that of the Englishman to both Hindus and Muslims produced an awareness which recognised the complexity of the situation and led to a kind of response which did not lead to a break with the past and instead reinforced this continuity. These challenges were comparatively simple and were confined to political or religious events. But the challenge now is of a different pattern. It is the challenge of reacting to a philosophy which undermines the human spirit and over-rates his intellect.

This challenge comes mainly from the West and its science. The scientific revolution, as we know, originated in Western Europe. How and why it originated and developed as it did, in the west is interesting but cannot be discussed here. Suffice it to say, it had much to do with the philosophy which the West was developing prior to this revolution. The challenge consequently comes both from philosophy and the kind of science that it has and continues to develop.

Science, as such, has much to its credit. It has succeeded in limiting disease and minimising human pain and suffering. It has built up human morale. Man now ventures to challenge dogma, superstition and authority. He can think and feel freely and this has helped him to pull down the walls of prison and slavery. It has reduced his manual drudgery and given him

leisure. We are now looking forward to new developments in cybrnetics computation and automation—to relieve him of mental drudgery. Today an average man has more leisure than he ever had. He also has far more material comforts than he ever had. In fact some countries of the West have become really affluent. Most people there have all that man could aspire for. In fact many a common man there enjoys more amenities than kings and princes did in recent years. But what is the other side of the picture? Western science and its handmaid, the industry, developed without a social conscience. It has and continues to invent the most destructive instruments of war. Historically, it induced the West to go abroad and enslave the less developed peoples and create colonial empires. It induced them to develop a new morality under which they exploited men/women and children of the weaker sections of the humanity, so that they could feed their own better. Half the human world was thus condemned to a life of hard toil, poverty, disease, slavery and helplessness for generation. It induced the governments also to develop a brand of morality which created and justified inequality amongst nations. It authorised persecution and repression of those who asked for freedom or equality. It exterminated some cultures and impoverished many more. It led them to get hold of the land of others and render the natives as foreigners in their homeland. It led to apartheid where man still cannot claim equality with man. It has given to the West and now to the East the philosophy to work for material affluence, multiply needs, work for the satisfaction of these and creation of more. For this purpose it has all along exploited not only the time and life of weaker section of humanity but also the tongueless Nature. It has been a proud slogan of the West to "conquer nature". And in this proud conquest, as has been pointed out earlier, it has destroyed much that is lovable, beautiful and in many ways essential for man's survival itself. We have already succeeded polluting water, air and space. "There is dreadful contamination and poisoning of rivers, oceans, shores by cities sewerage and water from tannaries and chemical plants. There is shocking

contamination of the air by smoke from factories, fall out from explosion of atomic bombs and in large industrial cities, the discharged vapours from motor vehicles".¹

There is revolt against established traditions and value system. Man has become a mere biological entity—he is no longer a wife, a husband, a brother or sister and so on. The society, in many parts of the world, is becoming permissive—a society whose the ideal is a return to nature in the image, perhaps of the commune or commonwealth of street dogs. This society undoubtedly lives as near to nature as possible. In this, it has no hypocrisy whatever. Trade and business have developed scientific methods to create needs and exploit the pocket of man than serve his need. The pharmacologist so organises his market that he sells the most needed life saving drug at the highest price. The most competent physician is available not to those who need him most, but to those who can pay. It may be that the physician does wish to serve him also who needs him most but we have created the condition that he just cannot. He is governed by his needs, not by the values of his profession. The politician professes noble ideals but as soon as it suits him he can change his colour. His behaviour is typified by the slogan "Aya Ram, Gaya Ram"² and so about other professions and vocations.

A crime which the Western Science could be accused of is that man, and particularly the weaker man, has to live in perpetual fear. Those who know science more are more powerful to destroy man. Nations of the world are in perpetual guard against one another and each one, in its own way, is trying to out do the other.

Their indeed is a kind of peace today in the world. But is this peace born of human wisdom and love for man and nature? No, it is not. It is the grim silence of humanity

1. The Emerging World; Chapter by Richard B. Gregg, p. 76.

2. Refers to the phenomena of changing party affiliations.

brought about by the dreadful fear of getting annihilated in the event of war or a miscalculation about war.

There is yet another crime which the West committed. In its enthusiasm to "educate" the non-west, it undermined its genius and imposed its own philosophy and system of education wherever it established its empire. The result is that today it is the educational system of the West, its value pattern and system of thought that are dominating the entire world. The rich variety that you could otherwise see has disappeared. It has been razed down to dull uniformity. The native modes of thought, however strange, grotesque, even 'uncivilized' could yet be unique. One of the worst criticisms of democracy as practised by the West during the last two centuries is that to the non-West it has been totalitarian at its best. It has destroyed variety and valued uniformity.

Such is the panorama of world situation and its forces that India is facing. During the British time the response to it was variegated. Some admired the British ways of life and started living it. They looked down upon all that was Indian, its dress, modes of thought, religion, religious books, art, literature, culture, etc. There were others both Indians and foreigners including the British, the French and the Germans who looked into the arts and literature of India and found it comparable with any in the world. Their efforts prepared the way and ultimately led to Indian Renaissance. More and more scholars began to study and interpret Indian literature and produced an array of distinguished Indians in all walks of life. This period was one of the most creative in India in the recent centuries. It restored confidence to the depressed and much abused spirit of India and gave it a new appreciation of the world and of its own culture and literature and whispered into its ear the role that it could play in enriching human life. The immediate fruit of this reaction was the political movement in the country and the emergence of Nehru-Gandhi Era. The Indian response to the West was typified, as discussed earlier, by these two great Indians. The essential India asserted itself through Gandhi. His concept

of human development, science, industry, technology, economics, administration, individual rights and obligations—all were based on mostly his understanding of the Indian way of life. He was not opposed to science or industry. But he was certainly concerned about human freedom. He did not want man to become the slave of another man or the machine. He was, in the truest tradition of Indian culture opposed to equating man, with his intellect. To him the spirit of man was greater than his intellect and he called this spirit his "inner-voice." To rationalists it may be a dangerous dogma, but it is there. However, this assertion cannot be read in isolation. It has to be read and understood in the context of his concept of the "good man".

He had a wonderful grasp of the Indian situation, its poverty, its abused spirit, its hurt pride, its filth and dirt and squalor, its superstition, its communal problem and many other ills of its social, economic and political life. He was also aware of the technological, scientific and economic philosophies of the west. But he drew solutions to Indian problems from the Indian situations and the Indian thought. Some of the concepts that he drew on were, the concept of the universal man ; the concept of self-sacrifice, Ahimsa and love for man and nature. Nehru's approach was different. He was a great intellectual and had a clear grasp of the growth of science and technology and the good it could do to humanity including India. The spirit of India and the rationalism of the west fused in the work of the two and provided a sound basis for Indian thought. Unfortunately Gandhi was murdered and there was none to replace him. Nehru was left alone and the Indian thought again became unbalanced. Gandhi wanted to develop man. Bereft of his influence, Nehru began to make him comfortable. Nehru almost worshiped Gandhi and called him a magician who could transform a sleeping nation into a nation on the march. Gandhi loved Nehru and made him his heir. But never did a disciple so quickly and so effectively influence the ideology of his master than Nehru did.

Many suspect we are rebuilding the West on the soil of

India. They ask what has happened to the quality of Indian education. Today what it is that we value most? Is it sense of sacrifice? Is it love for the fellow? Is it respect for one's duty? Is it concern for human dignity? Is it concern for values? Centuries ago Plato said "What is honoured in a country will be cultivated there" and so we are out to cultivate selfishness, material gain and power by any means. If we want a change and if we do not want to repeat the experience of the west, we have to honour a different set of values. Years ago some American thinkers felt "If the American people honour wisdom and goodness as they now honour power and success the system of universal free education would be quite different from what it is today".³ I am not aware how far Americans have been able to shift from power and success to wisdom and goodness and I am not aware how far India finds the need.

Gandhi developed a vision of India of his dreams. To achieve it one of the steps that he took with great enthusiasm and faith was to conceive the system of Basic Education. The system consequently is not a bundle of techniques put forth by a pedagogue but the functional aspect of a philosophy. This philosophy arose as we have tried to see, in response to India's urge to reassert itself. Some of us accepted the system as firm believers in a new vision of India and some as a convenient expedient suitable at the moment. Soon after the achievement of Independence and the murder of Gandhi, Nehru dominated the scene and he had his own vision of India. Gandhi stood for the supremacy of human spirit; at a lower level he stood for cottage and small scale industry, for decentralized economy and the principle of trusteeship in wealth. Nehru stood for the supremacy of the the intellect and science and at a lower level for heavy industry, comparatively centralised economy and rejected the principle of trusteeship as archaic. Here was an obvious ideological conflict. The system of Gandhi could not succeed. It became a 'fraud'. This failure held the mirror to the Indian mind of the day.

3. The Conflict in Education Robert M. Hutchins, p. 8.

Where do we stand today? Do we need science and industry? Can we, in a world which is all out for it, do without it. Is science or industry an evil? No, science after all is the pursuit of truth and this is in the highest tradition of man's spirit. What ails science today is not the spirit of science but the philosophy which utilizes it. Today we use it for the pursuit of affluence and power. Today it belongs to politics and economics. This is not the science we need. We need science which will help us in the pursuit of higher values. We want science to help us, know and cultivate the "good" and not simply provide us with the "pleasant". This, in fact, is the essence of Indian and Gandhian philosophy of life and education. Obviously, it has a potential for the growth and development of man and a potential for offering an alternative to the present philosophy. The search for an alternative philosophy is not limited to the East alone. The West also is in search of it. Many, therefore, in India and abroad are drawn to this philosophy. Recently we have begun talking about Gandhian values in education. What, however, we mean by Gandhian values is something very limited. We usually spell them as co-operation, safai, productive work, community work and so on. These activities are true of any system of education. There is nothing particularly Gandhian about them. But Gandhi did emphasise these. Basically, however, Gandhi stood for a particular philosophy of life and education. And if we talk of Gandhian education we ought to talk about this philosophy and not about a few peripheral aspects of it.

Recently we celebrated the International Education Year throughout the world. During this year countries all over devoted thought to many aspects of education; how to make it universal—how best to make it productive; and effective and so on. We in India also gave thought to its various aspects. We held seminars, conferences on technical education, primary and work oriented education and adult education and so on. All this is good but the more important and relevant question that the world may ask itself is; education for what? What is the direction towards which the world community is going? And what are the ways in

which each country can be enabled to identify its individuality and give expression to its true personality. The wisdom of the world certainly does not lie in any one region of the world. And the wealth of the world is not its land, philosophy or science but its human variety and its potential. And this variety needs to come to its own.

India has during the fifties and the sixties adopted a way of life which to some, is not the way she should have adopted. "Since India attained her political independence", says Arnold Toynbee, the eminent historian, "India has been on trial. While she was still struggling to win her independence she embraced Mahatma Gandhi's ideals and under his leadership she achieved her independence in the Gandhian way. But the attainment of independence has brought with it greater moral ordeal than the previous struggle for it". Discussing some of her political problems the historian asks "Would she not make a new start—a Gandhian start". I would extend the question to her problems of education and repeat "Could she not make a new start—a Gandhian start". The historian continues "This is a hard thing to ask of any nation; it is to ask a nation to rise above itself". I join the historian when he says "Yet this can be asked of India for in rising above herself, India could be rising to the spiritual level that Gandhi has set for her".⁴

Two years ago we celebrated the Gandhi centenary year. Much time and thought was devoted by some of the best thinkers and educationists to examine the relevance of Gandhian thought to modern times. Should the discussion and the time devoted to it and the thinking thus generated, not be utilised for the development of Indian thought at least, if not the thought of "modern times". Should India not seize the golden opportunity offered by the event and make known to the world the essence of his educational philosophy. The world, as shown above, does stand in need of an alternative philosophy and would be grateful to India if it took the

4. The Emerging World. Chapter by Arnold Toynbee, p. 24.

initiative to explain it, the way it should. And here is a philosophy which does offer an alternative to the existing incessive materialistic philosophy which has and continues to elevate the spirit of man on the one hand and undermine it on the other.⁵

5. We shall discuss some of the Gandbian values in more detail in the chapter VII on "Gandbian values in the present day world context"

Chapter 6

Balancing Values in Indian Education— Some Aspects

Educational thought in India is, at present, in a formative stage. Serious consideration is being given to its ideological as well as practical aspects. There is an earnest attempt to find what the cultural moorings of the country are and how best they can be strengthened.

Indian culture and civilisation is one of the rarest that has persisted down through the centuries. It has shown remarkable qualities of stability and resilience and has gracefully survived in spite of many a rise and fall that overtook and perished many others. In any scheme of education for this country, therefore, it is essential to find out what those qualities are that have given these characteristics to our country and enabled it to live an unbroken life or have proved detrimental to its growth.

A lookback at the history of the growth of our thought indicates that we have prized freedom of thought and expression whenever we have been creative.

In the development of religions and other philosophies this tradition proved extremely useful in the sense that people could develop without inhibition and contribute richly to the culture of the country. This is evident from the fact that we produced all kinds of thinkers, theists as well as atheists, monists as well as dualists, Advaitas, Vaishnavas, Shaivas, Shaktas and Sufies. In fact, the freedom of thought enjoyed by our seers and saints, scientists, mathematicians and artists has been

unique. This is indicated by the divergent and almost chaotic differences of outlook and opinions expressed by them. The views and opinions, for instance, in the Vedas or the Upanishads or the Brahmanas, illustrate the extent of freedom they enjoyed. Or the emergence of a number of religions, the innumerable shades of thought of each one of them or the acute and sharp differences between them also point to this freedom.

The Indian thought has occasionally been accused of being pantheistic, and the Hindus have been charged with worshipping innumerable Gods. Whatever the truth of these accusations, they definitely indicate the extent of freedom of thought that the Indians possessed and practised. Apart from the examples provided by literature, if we look to the routine beliefs of the people down through the centuries, we find that an individual enjoyed freedom to worship God in the form most suitable to him. If he so chose, he could conceive of Him as God without attributes—'Nirakar', or God with attributes—'Sakar', or could conceive of Him in the form of mother and call Her Durga or Kali and so on.* This freedom did not end with the political downfall of the Hindus. It continued to be valued during the Muslim era though it could not be asserted and expressed as effectively. The Muslims in India came from a different cultural pattern and since they had established political superiority with the help of physical force, it took Indians some time to meet the situation and assert this freedom.

A similar situation was created when the British conquered India. The British also came from a different cultural pattern but fortunately they were democrats at home and

* (a) "One is Agni (fire) kindled in many a spot"
 "One is Surya (sun) shining over all"
 "One is Usha (dawn) illuminating all this"
 "That which is one has become all this." —*Rigveda* (vii-58-2)

(b) This is again emphasised in the Gita where Lord Krishna says, "In whatever way men approach Me, even do I appreciate and reward them". "Whatever manifestation any devotee desires to worship with faith that same faith shall I vindicate."

believed in the freedom of thought and expression. In India, however, they were the rulers and had imperial motives. Whilst, therefore, the British rulers strove to keep us uneducated and undeveloped, British institutions, British scholars and British traditions did not fail to help us in understanding ourselves and reasserting our inherent belief in freedom of thought and expression. Unfortunately, during the period of foreign rule, we became poor and in order to live better began to hunt for small favours and whilst doing so, developed a new slant in our individuality under which we usually sacrificed our freedom for these favours. But in general, freedom of thought was valued.

This freedom unfortunately was circumscribed by the social set up. As soon as it took the form of '*Varna*' this freedom received a great setback. A person born into a particular '*Varna*' lost his freedom to that extent. A Brahmin, for instance, could not go beyond what the Brahmin caste was authorised to think and do. He could not eat with or marry freely a Shudra or a Vaishya. Such restriction on freedom are not novel to the Hindus. It is equally true of modern schools of political thought. Democcrats, for instance, cannot think beyond democracy and communists beyond socialism. But whatever the form, it is an indication of stability on the one hand and if taken too far, of decay on the other. This decay did overwhelm the Hindus on many occasions, and therefore, it must be guarded against.

Today the Indian academician, be he a school teacher or a university professor, is accused of not asserting his right to express his views frankly and boldly, particularly before the administrator and the politician. It is the latter who decides what the academician should say and do. Neither has the educationist been asserting his right to do so. He has in consequence lost his freedom or at least, he is not asserting it for his own or his professional growth. And since he has lost it or at least he does not exercise it, he is not prepared to offer it to his students. The result is that both teachers and students grow in an atmosphere where freedom of thought is neither valued nor cared for, nor yet exercised.

The Aryans in India were, like Romans in Greece, conquerors. But unlike the Romans, who converted the entire kingdom into an armed garrison and the entire population of the ruled into the helpless position of 'helots', the Aryans did not convert themselves into a race of armymen and the conquered people into a race of helots whom they could prey upon at will. Whilst the Romans found it necessary to subjugate and keep under control the ruled, the Aryans did not seem to have done so. On the contrary, they seem to have made efforts to understand the culture of the conquered, and adopted it. This they could not have done unless they had fully mixed with them and lived with them.

For instance, the findings at Mohenjo-daro and Harappa indicate that the concept of 'Shiva' was developed by the pre-Aryans and taken over by the Aryans. Some authorities are of the opinion that Lord Krishna was pre-Aryan who was owned by the Aryans as an Avatar of their own Pantheon. This is not to say that there were no quarrels between the conquerors and the conquered. In fact, the word "Mlechha" indicates that they did not respect the aboriginals and gave them a name. But there is no indication to say that they made a serious attempt to destroy their culture or to rule them with military might. There is also no evidence to show that the Aryans, unlike the Roman conquerors, tried to educate themselves in army barracks. Instead, we see that educational institutions developed in forest ashrams and the favourite games of the students were, not boxing and jumping and hunting the helot but living in the ashram with the teacher and collecting alms and fuel for him.

Just as the foundations of the Western culture and civilisation were laid on the culture developed by the Greeks and Romans in the city states of Athens, Sparta and Rome, the foundations of the Indian culture were laid by the Aryans in the forest ashrams. The entire superstructure of the Indian thought was built and elaborated on this culture. The result has been that the protagonists of the various view-points never made

an attempt to physically overpower and exterminate those who did not agree with them ; they rather tried to fuse and grow with them.

We do not, for instance, have any accounts of stories showing that the Brahmins tried to exterminate, by force, the Buddhists, the Shaivas or Vaishnavas and so on, though we do have evidence of sharp differences among them. This picture continued to be similar during the Muslim period, except for the rule of those kings and princes who had not tried to acquaint themselves with or understand the Indian way of life and culture. The truth, however, is that people respected each other's religion. There are many instances to show where kings of one faith respected people and institutions of other faiths. In fact, almost all religions emphasise that each is only one of the routes which leads to the realisation of God and, therefore, all of them need to be respected. In fact, this idea is again and again emphasised in the Upanishads, the Gita and other scriptures. Nowadays we speak of religious tolerance and call it a virtue. According to the Indian point of view, religious toleration is essentially a negative concept, it is an irreducible minimum of decent human behaviour.

India has not only tolerated the other man's point of view but appreciated and respected it. It has not stopped at this. In fact, it has gone beyond and developed a strong spirit of fusion and assimilation of diverse viewpoints into a new whole. This is borne out again and again through the long and chequered history of the country. The Buddha, for instance, assimilated all that was the best in the Upanishadic and Puranic literatures and gave it a new form and interpretation. How deeply he drank at the spring of Brahminic thought and how largely he observed it in his own thought is brought out by Prof. Rhys Davids. He says "Gautama's whole training was Brahminic. He probably deemed himself to be the most correct exponent of the spirit as distinguished from the letter of the ancient faith. In other words, Buddha's teaching was restatement of the thoughts of the Upanishads with a new emphasis."

To take another example: Shankaracharya observed all that was the finest in the Buddhist and Brahmin thought and gave a new shape to it. His knowledge of the Buddhistic thought was so great and the extent of the incorporation of this thought for the formation of his own so large, that he is suspected of being a subtle Buddha and was called 'Pracchanna' Buddha. The later movements, of which the most important are the Lingaya Shaivism of the South and Kashmir Shaivism of the North also give evidence of how largely they assimilated the earlier and diverse national and international influences.

With the developing contacts between Pathans, Mughals and other Muslims, with Hindus important changes began to come about in the major aspects of Indian life, including religion. The cult of personal God which had started with Lord Krishna's Gita, got momentum and led to the rise of the Bhakti cult, particularly in the north. As the two religions began to mix, the new ideology gave birth to men like Kabir and Nanak, to a new faith called Sufism and a new sect known as the Sikhs. With the coming of western trade and christian missionaries and the conquerors, we began to come in touch with a new cultural pattern. India proved a fertile ground for the christian missionaries and today we have a few millions of christians all over the country.

The picture of the tribes, communities, races, castes and religions in India is most unique. These diverse elements have once again demonstrated their inner urge and will to fuse and live together.

It may be recalled that a section of the erstwhile India did not believe in the spirit of fusion and assimilation and wanted to live separately. When the British granted them a separate home, the rest of India could most easily have declared itself a Hindu India, as the Muslim League wanted. But the miracle that a strong culture can produce happened and the Hindus, in spite of all the advantages that a Hindu State could have given them, voluntarily offered to share their

joys and sorrows with the minorities. A similar miracle happened in a part of the country where the Muslim majority community refused to merge with Muslim Pakistan and joined secular India. Also the Hindus at this time could easily have repeated what the Muslims in Pakistan did and reduced the minority into second-rate citizens. But this they did not do and prepared to live a secular life which presupposes a spontaneous, co-operative, all inclusive life and not an exclusive life.

Indian thought grew round the idea that the physical growth of an individual is essential to the extent that he can carry out his mental and spiritual obligations. It did not emphasise the growth of physical development as a virtue in itself. Physical growth was subordinated to the needs of mental and spiritual tasks—the main function of man being mental and spiritual.

Accordingly, therefore, the nature of physical exercises was developed in a way that would prove conducive for such growth. These exercises are known as Yogic Asanas and do not have anything in them which leads to violence of thought or even violence in physical movements. In effect, it meant paying more and more attention to mental and spiritual tasks and less attention to physical development. No doubt this helped to make a rich contribution to learning in the various fields of human life—mathematics, medicine, art, sculpture, painting, religion, poetry, drama and so on, but simultaneously it impoverished the entire country insofar as physical development was concerned.

Physical development here is used in a large sense, to include physical build and the tasks connected with it. Except on a few occasions, we could not develop into a physically virile nation. Only seldom could we produce a strong army capable of protecting itself against foreign invaders. Whenever a foreign invader thought of invading India he could do so with ease. Maybe, there are many reasons for this well-known phenomenon, but it is irrefutable that our forces more often than not proved weaker than those of our conquerors, right

from the coming of the Aryans down to the Chinese aggression. We are also told that we could never develop as a great power and go beyond our borders as conquerors. We have a ready explanation for this and we say that we never wanted to build an empire by military force, although we did build an empire in the literary, religious and other fields. And this is largely true.

The important question, however is : why has India mostly been overrun by foreign invaders and why has she not gone beyond her borders as a conqueror? This phenomenon may have many reasons, but the one most outstanding has been the faith that India has always believed in the force of an idea—"shabda". She has always believed that an idea is stronger than any force. Her faith in this has been so great that she never thought it necessary to support it by any other assistance. This is one of the reasons why many Indian religions did not develop an organised Church in the form, for instance, Christianity did. Indian saints and seers never sought the protection of the State or the Church to explain or propagate their ideas. And this explains the spread of Indian culture, religion, sculpture and art beyond India's borders, without the assistance and patronage of the Indian State or the Church.

The history of the saints and seers of some other religions indicates a different approach—an approach under which they were assisted and followed by the State or the church authorities. The Indian saints and seers had firm belief in the soundness of their idea and tried to spread it on its own merits, without the assistance of any other agency, state or church. We are generally proud of an achievement like this today.

This went on well for a time but as soon as other forces cropped up, the saints and seers lost the leadership. History of the world is replete with examples where material and physical forces have succeeded, at least immediately, in conquering and subduing, mental and spiritual forces.

It is not only today that a Mao says that power flows

from the barrel of a gun. There have always been Maos all over the world and at all times. And so, in the case of India also, the inevitable happened. Exclusive emphasis on mental growth, to the neglect of physical and material growth, led to the country being overrun by physically and militarily stronger nations. It also led to the aftermath that follows such a position. It seems we are learning the lesson now.

It is often stated that the Indian outlook is predominantly spiritualistic. What an average Indian respects in his heart of hearts is spiritualism. This is true even of a person who is thoroughly materialistic in outlook. Theoretically India has produced advocates of material as well as of spiritual well-being. The earliest philosophers who advocated an atheistic or materialistic philosophy have been the Charvakas. Their point of view proved a challenge to all subsequent philosophers.

Religious philosophers of almost all schools of Indian thought assert that the aim of life is the realisation of Self and in the process of doing so the material world is important but not important enough. Spiritual realisation transcends the stage of materialism and consequently material world ceases to have importance after a certain stage. One has, therefore, to give up attachment to material world at a certain stage. In effect this means that if you want to be spiritual you cannot be material.

Thus an antithesis developed between spiritual and material life. If you enjoy material life, you cannot have spiritual life and conversely if you enjoy spiritual life, you cannot have material life. Man's immediate concern is with the material and an Indian is no exception to it. Emphasis on the spiritual and denigration of the material to a secondary position developed a split personality among Indians. The result was that we created a class of people who loved the material and the comforts it offers but who at the same time upheld the supremacy of spiritual values. In due course need began to be felt to re-understand this philosophy. And the first effective revolt

came from Kashmir Shaivism which recognised the world as real and not as *maya*. Kashmir Shaivism accepts the world as real and, therefore, does not avoid enjoying it. Unfortunately Kashmir Shaivism could not get time to develop the thesis on account of the political and administrative disturbances that followed its birth in the State.

The idea, however, was again developed by Swami Vivekananda, Tilak and Gandhi in a different way. They accepted the importance of the material for man. Swami Vivekananda said, "Him I call a mahatma who feels for the poor." And Gandhiji said, "To a people famishing and idle, the only acceptable form in which God can dare appear is work and promise of food and wages."

When an Indian talks of spiritual life, he has in the background the spiritual life of an individual who leads it. In strict terms it connotes the idea of an attempt for the realisation of *Nirvana* or *Moksha*, or realisation of the Self for the individual who practises it. It does not have any social implications in it.

What have been the implications of this serious national attempt through the centuries to denigrate the material and exhalt the spiritual in the country ?

One can at once say that this philosophy provided an unparalleled example of a whole nation voluntarily attempting to give up material comforts for the sake of a supreme idea for not just a year or two, but for centuries together, thus providing an example that man can give up material comforts for living a better life if that can achieve it.

On the other hand, denigrating the material, robbed the Indians of the opportunities of probing deeper and deeper into nature and its mysteries. It is not incidental that we produced a very great galaxy of thinkers, all in abstract knowledge, through the ages, but comparatively fewer ones in the physiological and biological sciences. We did produce scientists and medical men, but not many. The result has been that we lagged behind in science and technology and consequently in

industry and other important needs of life like defence and offence services. Lack of opportunities in an important aspect of life led to poverty and decay. And as soon and as often this inner strength weakened, decay overtook us and we fell prey to forces, internal and external.

According to most schools of Indian thought, the aim of life is the realisation of Self. The word 'Self' has not been left undefined and an attempt has been made to say what 'it' means. Here again, most of the schools of thought identify the Self with *Brahma* Himself. The realisation of Self, therefore, amounts to the realisation of *Brahma*. In fact, it has been asserted by some as: "I am *Brahma*."

Human life accordingly is not just a ray of the divine, but is divinity itself. From this point of view, no limits have been put upon the growth that an individual can aspire to. He can aspire to reach that level which is within and yet beyond the understanding and comprehension of man at a particular time. Man can be as great as he aspires. This unbridled freedom to the individual to grow in the image of *Brahma* is, indeed, a very large concept under which individuality can grow. There is no limit to its growth, but an all-open space to grow into. This assertion has been followed up with an active programme in an almost infinite variety. Different men are always at different stages of growth and can aspire to a position which they think can be achieved. Man has, therefore, been given unrestricted freedom to proceed in a way he may like to develop. It is this principle which is the basis of what is called pantheism in Hinduism.

Religion, indeed, is the most personal function for a Hindu. In this he needs no assistance and no company of any other person, be it his wife, his father or his son. He lives it at alone. Even today those Hindus, who perform prayers, do it all by themselves. There are, however, certain rituals pertaining to social life where it is incumbent on a person to

have his consort by his side. But insofar as his personal prayers or personal religion is concerned, he is absolutely alone.

This exclusive emphasis on individuality has been so great that it amounts to a chaotic condition. True, we have occasions where religious performances are made by groups together but this is for societal purposes. The result has been that the Hindus have developed an exclusive way of life where the individual lives absolutely by himself and does not depend upon his fellow beings. This has produced disastrous effects insofar as the development of social sense is concerned.

For instance, even after developing such a stable and lasting social system as the *Varna Ashrama* where the whole society is divided into four social groups—the life in each group continues to be distinctly separate from every other group, while the life of a group in *Varna* also continues to be distinctly different from that of the other fellows in the *Varna*. The Brahmins, for instance, continue to live a separate existence from the Vaishyas or the Shudras or the Brahmins of one caste continue to live very differently from Brahmins of another caste, or even of the same caste. A Brahmin in one house continues to live and worship a god separate from that of a Brahmin in another house, and so on. Such distinctions, though they contributed towards the stability of a particular caste, did come in the way of mutual accommodation and understanding.

This phenomenon did not remain confined to Hindus. It spread to other religions also. For instance, when a Hindu Brahmin or Kshatriya was converted to Christianity he retained his entire mental set-up and continued to live like a Brahmin or a Kshatriya. In fact such converts are known as Brahmin Christians or Kshatriya Christians. They would not easily care to marry in a non-Brahmin Christian or Kshatriya family.

The result has been that every Indian lives in a world of his own, around which he has created difficult walls which separate him from the other Hindus in the same caste or another caste. This religio-social formation of the Hindus had equally

disastrous effect on their developing a political life. The history of the country is an eloquent testimony to the fact that Indians could not move together as one community in many periods of its history. While it would be totally incorrect to say that one community was at war with another, it will be completely correct to say that each community lived in splendid isolation and disregard of another community or sub-caste. It is also correct to say that they could not join hands together and live as one people belonging to one nation. Today, once again we find that there is emphasis on groupism and communalism. The reasons for this have to be traced to this emphasis on individualism, the comparative lack of social sense amongst the Hindus particularly and the Indians generally.

It is, therefore, imperative that we understand this basic phenomenon of our life and whilst we continue to make efforts to develop the individuality of each Indian, we also try, and perhaps with greater vigour, to develop a social sense and social purpose which have been lacking so far.

In India people of different castes, creeds, communities, religious beliefs and ethnic groups try to live together. India, in fact, is a heaven for diversities and yet a thread of unity runs through this verigated diversity. This has been so all through the centuries. It began with the coming of the Aryans. It was later strengthened by the coming of the Kushans, Huns, Pathans, Mughals and others, and at a later date, the Westerners. We, indeed, have protagonists of different castes and creeds. But each of these castes and creeds has its own sub-castes and sub-creeds. There are the famous four *Varnas*, Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras. Yet among the Brahmins themselves, there are castes and subcastes, similarly there are castes and sub-castes amongst the Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras. There are religions and sub-religions, communities and sub-communities, language groups and sub-language groups i.e., those who speak a language and those who speak a dialect only.

There are various ethnic groups in different parts of the country. The remarkable fact, however, is that there have been no attempts by any of these groups or sub-groups to exterminate the others. There have been no religious wars, no communal wars and no ethnic wars. This is very much unlike the history of the western peoples where we find the Anglo-Saxons fighting the Jews and both of them the Muslims; Protestants fighting the Catholics, the Catholics fighting the Puritans; the Germans fighting the French, the French fighting the English and so on.

What is the basic principle which has brought about this very wide human understanding amongst Indians because of which they have shown this amazing amount of understanding about each other all through the centuries? What again is the principle which runs as a sub-stratum forming the foundation for unity in all this large diversity? This principle is laid down in the most ancient of Indian books. The *Rig Veda* says: "That which is one has become all this." This is realisation of the fact that all that exists in the universe flows from the same Creator.

It was this broad understanding of human values which led Indian seers like Buddha and Ashoka and Shankara to think of man not in terms of Indian and non-Indian, but as man just anywhere on the earth. The entire range of Hindu scriptures is illuminated by the absence of reference to any localised man—Indian or non-Indian. All discussion centres round man the universal. It is again this great truth which enabled persons like Ashoka or Buddha or Gandhi to eschew violence from their mind; for, to hurt any would be the same as hurting oneself. Modern world needs actual bloodshed to understand that violence is bad. This has been brought out comprehensively by Mr. Toynbee. He says, "The Indian missionaries of an Indian philosophy, Buddhism, were the first people in history to think and feel in terms of the human race as a whole. They felt a concern for all their fellow human beings; they had a vision of mankind as being potentially a single family and they set themselves to turn this potential unity into an accomplished fact by peaceful persuasion. These Buddhist ideals were first conceived

of about 2,500 years ago; their relevance to human needs is perennial, and they have never been more relevant than they are in the Atomic Age. All honour to those pre-atomic-age Indian seers and leaders, the Emperor Ashoka and Mahatma Gandhi. These great souls had the *spiritual insight* to appreciate the intrinsic wrongness of animosity and violence, without having to wait to have this truth hammered into their minds by the horrifying object lesson of Nagasaki and Hiroshima." Unity of all existence is thus enshrined in the most ancient and most respected sacred books of India. It is a fundamental fact of her life.

Today we are faced with the question of national integration. All thinking men in the country are exercised about it and are trying to find the solution. Committees at national level and other smaller committees have been set up to examine the forces that are against it as also the forces that can help in bringing it about. Competent persons have thrown out innumerable suggestions to achieve integration. The important question is: why do we face such a question at all? It seems we face it because we have not tried to learn, understand and practise the basic tenet of the philosophy: "That which is one has become all this." It is imperative that this philosophy is once again broadcast all over the country and made known to all. We can ignore it only at our peril. This is indeed difficult; yet if we want national integration, we will have to base it on this fundamental tenet of our ancient philosophy.

The country is passing through a critical stage of its growth. Great changes are taking place all over the world. New ideas and forces are born almost every day. Change is speedier today than it was at any time in the past. The future is alluring, but unstable and insecure. The past is rich. There is need to re-examine the past, separate the grain from the chaff and use it as a stable foundation for future growth.

Perhaps at no time was the responsibility of educators greater than it is today, for the forces today at play are greater, more vigorous and faster. The danger in such a position is that if the roots are not firm, we may be blown off, root and branch.

Chapter 7

Gandhian Values In The Present Day World Context

Today the world is at a mental, physical and spiritual stage which perhaps is the highest in the annals of man. The world is not only one, but it has shrunk in time and space. The cultures and ideologies that took years and even centuries to take the form they have, stand face to face, trying to understand each other, fight each other, and in the process lead mankind to newer heights or turmoils and travails or even death. The large diversity of the world is, indeed, its real wealth and yet an essential source of discord. There are the developed and the developing nations; the ancient and the new peoples. There are peoples with long memories, strong traditions as well as peoples with youthful vigour, freshness of mind and comparative freedom from inhibitions. There are various political philosophies, religious, social and economic schools of thought. Above all there is the man's spirit, over riding all these narrow limitations trying to grow and get beyond these and yet derive from them whatever he considers the best. But this fascinating panorama of human struggle is after all not so fascinating. It tells you what man has made of man, century after century, in the sincere and honest belief that he knows the truth and must defend it.

But thanks to science and technology, the world today is different. Man is having a hard look at his beliefs, achievements and failures. He certainly has had his failures but his achievements have been fantastic. There is no knowing of what future possibilities lie ahead. These achievements have destroyed many

of his beliefs and rocked him out of many a value he held fast and dear.

Values, as we know, change from time to time, place to place and even man to man and today when man has crossed the thus far known horizon, set his foot on the Moon and is out to know more about other planets, to talk of values seems rather regressive. And yet we do feel the need. And that, perhaps, is the justification. What values of tomorrow can be, or ought to be, none can say. And yet man all over the world does talk of values: Why? Is it that there is an inborn resistance to change? Is it that the spirit of man is ever on the look out to find all that is the best either in his past or present which he is out to look for and assimilate? Is it that he is not satisfied with just change, he wants to grow—grow into manhood? Is it this inner call that makes him look back to Buddha, Jesus, or Gandhi?

We do not know answers to these questions and even if we did, we could not be sure. May we then begin by asking why do we care to know what place Gandhian values have in the present day world context? We shall attempt an answer to this question with the assumption which is true of all ages and all times—that everything is not well in the world inspite of its science, technology, industry, sociology and psychology. For doing this we shall examine some of the main trends and practices of human thought, their strengths and weaknesses and try to find if Gandhian values have any place in human growth.

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, was born and brought up in a particular, social, religious and political atmosphere. The value pattern that he adopted and professed grew partly out of this and partly the world situation. He, however, was mainly concerned with India. He was keenly aware of the problems that India was facing, poverty, illiteracy, supersitition, disease, the narrow caste, communal and religious differences, and the dehumanizing influences emanating from political subordination.

Tilak, Gokhle, Lala Lajpat Rai¹ and a host of other leaders who preceded Gandhi had worked hard and created a new atmosphere in the country. But the methods they adopted were not indigenous; they knew and were proud of Indian culture and heritage but could not cull out a strategy or an approach out of it for securing freedom for India. Though mentally free, they were still slaves of the British methods.

The credit of conceiving and adopting an approach based on Indian value pattern for solving these mighty problems goes to Gandhi and Gandhi alone. It would not be possible to go to the basic philosophy of this approach here. But some aspects of it can be stated. One of the fundamental aspects of this value pattern was his faith in man. In Indian philosophy an individual is identified with the "BRAHAMA" which translated in free language means that an individual has the potential and promise of having and developing the qualities of Brahama, the Creator. Gandhi therefore, had faith in the quality man.

This basic value that man has the potential and promise of the Creator is reflected in other schools of Indian thought, that of the Upnishads. In the Upnishads "the word Brahman refers both to the aspiration in man's soul, the outgoing of the spirit, prayer as well as the object sought, the ultimate Reality. The seeking of man is inspired by the Eternal in him."² And to Buddha, man is his own refuge, He said.

My action is my possession,
 My action is my inheritance;
 My action is the race to which I belong,
 My action is my refuge."

Human history does provide refreshing examples where man has asserted and reasserted faith and confidence in his

-
1. Shri Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Gopal Krishna Gokhle and Lala Lajpat Rai were some of the most prominent scholars and political leaders of the country when Gandhi appeared on the scene.
 2. Religion in a changing World S. Radhakrishnan P. 66 George Allen & Unwin Ltd , London.

ownself. In our times, Gandhi and Nehru were not the only men who did so. We have another great man of the century, President Kennedy of America who showed equal faith in man, his spirit and his reason. He said 'Our problems are man made, therefore, they can be solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants. No problem of human destiny is beyond the reach of human beings. Man's reason and spirit have resolved the seemingly unsolvable and we believe they can do it again'.¹ Gandhi believed that man is potentially good and if he does not behave in the manner he should at a particular moment of his life, he has the potential to overcome this weakness and be a good man. As is well known, he hated sin and not the sinner. The value with which he choose to fight the mighty British Empire was, therefore, based, not on external agencies or materials, the guns or bullets but the quality man. His objective was to drive away the British Ruler from the land and the method he choose to do so was, not to start a compaign of hate against him and aim bullets at his head, but to build up a constructive programme of improving the quality of man in India. "I am not interested in freeing India mainly from the English yoke. I am bent upon freeing Indian from any yoke, whatever. Hence for me the movement of Swaraj is a movement of self purification."²

According to Mr. Abid Husain the main object of his programme was to make it "an instrument of the moral and spiritual regeneration of India and only secondarily one of her political liberation and economic progress."³ This programme took various dimensions. He continuously emphasised that the Indian should be more conscious of his duties to himself and to the nation, that he should develop faith and confidence in himself and not only in himself but also in potential good-

-
1. The Emerging world, P. 115
Quoted in Jawahar Lal Nehru Memorial Volume
Asia Publishing House, New Delhi.
 2. Young India June 12, 1924.
 3. The way of Nehru and Gandhi P. XV.
S Abid Hussain.
Asia Publishing House, New Delhi.

ness of the Englishman, his ruler. "The true source of rights is duty. If we all discharge our duties, rights will not be far to seek."¹ He said, "We believe that nothing but the strictest adherence to honesty, fair play, and charity can advance the true interests of the country."² Given this, he had full faith in persuading man to part with power willingly, however difficult that might be. At the time of the Round Table Conference in 1931 when the tide was moving heavily against him he is said to have expressed to his friend C.F. Andrews "I must see Sir, so and so this week end, a hard man but a just man; I will say to him, "If you convince me that you are right I shall go to the people of India and tell them so, If I convince you that I am right, you must go to the people of England and tell them so."³ His faith in man, in his sense of justice and goodness did work, not at the moment but just a few years later.

The way that India and Britain parted is indeed an epoch making event in the history of mankind but it is a greater event in the process of the evolution of human qualities towards a nobler stage. Arnold Toynbee the great historian has described this phenomena in his own inimitable style. He says "When in my last visit to Delhi, I was standing by Gandhiji's shrine, to pay reverence to him, I was thinking to myself; Has there ever been another case in which a leader in a successful struggle for political liberation has been a benefactor, not only to his own people, but also to the nation from whose rule he has helped his own people to free themselves? Gandhi made it impossible for the people of my country to go on ruling India, and at the same time he did this in a way that made it possible for the British to withdraw without irretrievable discredit or disgrace. I should say that Gandhiji's service to my country has been not much less great than his service to his own country. It is comparatively easy to take possession of an empire; but it is fearfully

-
1. *Young India*, January, 1925.
 2. *Young India*, January 4, 1929.
 3. *India Since 1947* by A Chakravarti P. 299 (W. E. Hocking)
Allied Publishers, India.

difficult to give up possession when it has been acquired.'¹

Inside the country this value achieved a still higher and nobler form. The Britishers, it is true had strong interests in India, political, economic and business but their connections were not long enough—just a period of 200 years and consequently did not have deep roots. But the situation in regard to schedule castes and tribes had far deeper roots. We had denied social, economic and political equality to these castes, tribes and backward classes and also to women for centuries. This seemed a normal course of life and was accepted by the different castes and tribes without much resentment for years but as it was considered an evil and the necessity to remove was felt, Gandhi took up the question in his characteristic way. He boldly said "I consider untouchability to be a heinous crime against humanity." But he did not wage war against the caste Hindu. He had faith in the goodness even of the caste Hindu and he did succeed. The centuries old evil was tackled fairly successfully without a drop of blood being shed or a war being fought. Today all Indians are equal in the eyes of law and the miracle has been achieved basically on the basis of the value that man is potentially good and what it more, he can be so.

His attempt to remove inequality of women was comparatively easier, for Indian literature and Indian religious thought had theoretically given a position of equality to women with men but the centuries old traditions and moors of thought were against this. But Gandhi succeeded eminently within the shortest possible time to restore equality to Indian women, again without a war or even a symbolic agitation or protest in this behalf.

Today women in India are playing as important and as onerous duties and functions as men. The result is that today we have a very large number of women administrators, legislators, social workers, teachers and others. Recently our Prime

1. *One World and India* P. 52, 53. Arnel'd Toynbee, Orient Longman, Delhi.

Minister was asked as to how it was that she, a lady, was the Prime Minister of a big country. The statement looked strange to our Prime Minister as well as to common man in India.

Faith in man today is almost a rare phenomena both at the individual as well as national levels. What we do have today is fear, not faith. Gandhi's life and message do promise a ray of hope in restoring faith in the potential goodness of man.

To Gandhi, truth was a fundamental value. In his later years he began to say "Truth is God,"¹ though earlier he used to say God is truth. Human beings all over the world accept truth as a fundamental value. What then is the significance of Gandhi's truth value? Its significance lies firstly in the fact that he made it the basis of his work and secondly that he gave a new orientation or interpretation to it. We shall try to see what, if any meaning, it has for the world to day.

"What is truth." Gandhi asked. He could not answer it for others, but he did it for himself, and called it "the voice within." Again, he asked why do "different people think of different and contrary truths"?

He answered the question and this answer is significant, "Well, seeing that human mind is not the same for all, it follows that, what may be truth for me, may be untruth for another³." This interpretation of truth is in line with the different schools of Indian thought. Indian saints and seers who devoted their lives in trying to know what truth is, could not say "this and only this is the truth." In fact they came to almost a contrary conclusion. Brihadaranyak Upnishad, for instance, says "Not

-
1. *The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi* P. 10. R. K. Prabhu & U.R. Rao. Oxford University Press, London, 1945.
 2. *Selection from Gandhi*, Nirmal Kumar Bose P. 5. Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad.
 3. *Selection from Gandhi*, Nirmal Kumar Bose, P. 5. Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad.

this is the truth," "Not this is the truth,¹ "or the Reality is one and the wise call it by many names." This understanding and interpretation of truth produced varedated influence on Indian thought. It has been responsible for the creation of so many schools of religious thought and plurality of ideas as well as a deep sense of appreciation and good will for the convictions and beliefs of others. It enables the Indian to see truth in more than one way or form. It led him to what is popularly known as the worship of many Gods. But it emaciated his faith in what he thought was truth, for he was all the while concerned to see the other side of it and often, it led him to a sort of indifference towards it. Perhaps this was one of the reasons that led Gandhi to coin the word Satyagraha i. e. belief in truth and insistence on its presentation but not necessarily its acceptance by others. Nevertheless, the Indian saw truth, not only in his own religion, but in other religions also ; in his own way of life, as well as in that of others. "I believe in the fundamental truth of all religions of the world" declared Gandhi."² Consequently he respected not only his own religion, but that of others also. The word "toleration" has become a virtue now because we have become intolerant. In Indian cultural background, it is a negative term. What is proper is not toleration but active appreciation and respect. Centuries ago when Ashoka the great Emperor proclaimed, "persons of all religions should also be honoured suitably."³ In the west the concept of truth was different. The westerner saw the truth and could not tolerate untruth. "Whilest therefore, the Indian saw the truth in his own religions, he did not deny it to others ; the westerner saw the truth in his own religion, his economic philosophy or political philosophy and in no other. And this led to religious and economic exploitation and political

-
1. *The Upnishada. An authology.* "He, the self, is not this
"He is incomprehensible, for he can never be comprehended",
P. 247. D.S. Sharma, Bhavan's Book University, Bombay.
 2. *An Autobiography.* M.K. Gandhi 1948 Ed. P. 38.
 3. *Edict No. 12.*

subjugation." Thanks to the advances that science is now making, man's vision of truth is getting progressively wider. It has destroyed the tyranny of dogmatic truth. "Truth is now tentative, not final and revealed."¹

The interpretation of truth and the serious attempt that he made to give practical shape to it, made it possible to develop the concept of secularism in India. Secularism is possible only if you accept that truth has many forms and you respect the religion or views of others as much as you do your own. The growth of the concept met with hard difficulties for a time. And the period when this happened, the subcontinent underwent a blood bath. Man became a beast and killed each other. Such phenomena are not new. Whenever, truth became a partisan, man was overtaken by decay, war and violence. The world provides ample evidences of this unhappy phenomena. Fortunately it is now being recognised that "The Plurality of nations must be preserved just because each has to learn from the criticism inherent in alternative experiments, in law-making, in ideology; yet each must hold faith in a total civilization which has learnt how to resolve conflicting interests, and even apparently conflicting ideals, without resorting to war, and without capitulating to evil."²

The world today is facing this diversity with all its differences and irreconcilable philosophies because it is not prepared to accept a different concept of truth, a readiness and patience to see what the other aspect of the truth is. It seems that the freedom of man is in peril, not because, we do not know the truth but because we know it. The life and work of Gandhi can help in realising that there can be more than one approach to understanding and appreciating the truth. And if we do that,

-
1. *The Emerging World, Nehru Memorial Volume* P. 23. Sir Eric Ashby. Asia Publishing House, Bombay—New Delhi.
 2. *India Since Independence.* A Chakravarti P. 104 (W. E. Hocking).

we may, not only lessen human agony but also make life on earth lighter and brighter.

One of the most outstanding contributions of Gandhi to the realm of values is non-violence. In his introduction to *All Men are Brothers*, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, Ex-President of India said, "Gandhi was the first in human history to extend the principle of non-violence from the individual to the social and political plane."¹ Much has been written and spoken on it all over the world. And the persistent question that is being raised is: Is it relevant or practical in the present world? Today the world seems to believe that violence or war is the law of history; it is the ultimate solution of human problems. This is evident from the fact that all nations are continuously preparing for war. They employ some of their best scientists, intellectuals to invent some of the most destructive weapons of war, and since the fear that the others are or must be doing better, each nation is striving hard to out do the other. The result has been that two of the most 'developed' nations the USSR, and the USA alone have produced atomic stocks which could "over kill mankind 10 times over."² Not satisfied with this poor preparation, the nations are busy in producing various kinds of bacteriological weapons which can produce anthrax, dysentery, brucellosis, glanders, plague, tulermia, Q. Fever etc.

The chief merit of non-violence lies in the fact that it challenges these assumptions. Violence, it asserts, is not inevitable; non-violence and not violence is the law of human species. It also assures that war and violence are not the causes, but the results of certain causes.

In his essay on "Breakdown of a civilization, Richard B. Gregg says "If the real disease lies deeper than the threatened war, if the wars are chiefly symptoms, then the movements

-
1. *All Men are Brothers P. VII. Krishna Kriplani, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad. Indian Edition of the UNESCO Publication.*
 2. *Gandhi Marg, January 1968, Pp. 82, 83.*

of the disease are too deep, too powerful, and endowed with too much momentum to be affected by verbal appeals of resolutions passed by any convention. There is no use asking for peace unless we give up the assumption and activities that make the conflict or war."¹

Does the Gandhian non-violence help in removing "The assumption and activities that make the conflict or war." Even a cursory examination of the concept and implications of non-violence indicates that it does. Let us examine some of the main factors that warrant such an assertion. Non-violence works in two ways. It fights violence with the weapon of non-violence. It works for the creation of a social order which seeks to remove the causes of war and violence and what is more, for generating regard and love for one another. For instance non-violence is defined as "the law of our species as violence is the law of the brute."² It has no place for exploitation."³ Non-violence in the very nature of things is of no assistance in defence of ill-gotten gains and immoral acts."⁴ On the positive side "Ahmisa i.e. Non-violence means the largest love, greatest charity."⁵ "There is no place for cowardice in it. "The practice of Ahmisa calls forth the greatest courage."⁶ And it is a conscious, deliberate restraint upon one's desire for vengeance."

-
1. *Gandhi Marg*, Jul, 1962. P. 233. New Delhi, India.
 2. *Mahatma Gandhi* P. 48, Jawaharlal Nehru, Asia Publishing House, New Delhi.
 3. "The direct result of the exploitation of the section of humanity by another is that the exploiting section becomes a slave to its desire of satisfying its needs which grow with its ever rising standard of living. At the same time this exploitation directly results in conflicts between individuals and nations." *Legacy of Gandhiji* P. 107, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Shiva Lal Agrawala & Co., Delhi.
 4. *The Harijan* 1933 onwards, 5 9.36 P. 236.
 5. *Speeches and writings of Mahatma Gandhi* Fourth Edition. P. 346. G.A. Natesan & Co., Madras.
 6. *Ibid.* P. 346.

Gandhi gave a concrete shape to these ideas in the India of his dream. In his ideal society of India "there shall be no high class or low class, all communities shall work for an India...in which there shall be no high class and low class of people, an India in which all communities shall live in perfect harmony. There can be no room in such an India for the curse of untouchability or the curse of intoxicating drinks and drugs. Women shall enjoy the same rights as men. Since we shall be at peace with all the rest of the world neither exploiting nor being exploited, we should have the smallest army imaginable. All interests not in conflict with the interests of the dumb millions will be scrupulously respected, whether foreign or indigenous. Personally, I hate distinction between foreign and indigenous. This is the India of my dreams I shall be satisfied with nothing else."¹ To him true democracy was true non-violence. "My notion of democracy is, that under it the weakest should have the same opportunity as the strongest. That can never happen except through non-violence."²

He also believed that what is true of an individual can be equally true of a nation." It is a profound error" he said, "to suppose that whilst the law is good enough for individuals it is not for masses of mankind."³ In fact this seems to have been the reason why he asked the Indian National Congress to accept the idea of non-violence.

He did not insist on the Congress to accept it as a creed; he was content if the Congress accepted it as a policy to begin with⁴. The Congress, as is well known, did not accept it as a

1. Quoted in *the Essential Gandhi*, Louis Fisher P. 196. George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London.
2. *Selection from Gandhi*, P. 147, Nirmal Kumar Bose, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad.
3. *Mahatma, life of Mohandas Karam Chand*, V. 343. D. C. Tendulkar. Vithalbhai K. Jhaveri & D. G. Tendulkar, Bombay.
4. *As a realist Gandhi knew that non-violence is an ideal to be achieved. He made no secret of it.* "A Government cannot succeed in becoming entirely non-violent because it represents

[Contd. on next Page]

creed for there were many who did not believe in it. Even Nehru, whom Gandhi had named as his heir apparent did not believe in it. He says 'I did not give an absolute allegiance to the doctrine of non-violence or accept it for ever, but it attracted me more and more, and the belief grew upon me that, situated as we were in India and with our background and traditions, it was the right policy for us.'¹ At a latter stage the gulf widened still further. This was when the country was faced with the approaching war and India was also threatened. Civil Disobedience which was infact the functional aspect of non-violence in the field of politics, was considered out of question in the face of an invading army or between two opposing armies. Passivity or acceptance of invasion were equally out of question. What then ? His own colleagues and the Congress generally had rejected Non violence for such an occasion or as an alternative to armed resistance to invasion and he had at last agreed that they had a right do so."²

It is therefore, evident that this difference with regard to practicability of non-violence between Gandhi and his closest colleagues is very significant. It reaffirms the belief that violence is considered the ultimate solution of human problems even in India and that man is helpless when there is violence all around. Even the land of Gandhi had to go to war four times during the short period of 25 years of independence Outside India, violence erupted at so many places both in the East

all the people. I cannot conceive of such a golden age. But I do believe in the possibility of a pre-dominantly non-violent society. And I am working for it. In the ideal state, therefore, there is no political power because there is no state. But the ideal is never fully realised in life. Hence the classical statement of Thoreau that, that Government is the best which governs the least."

Quoted in The Way of Gandhi and Nehru P. 50, S. Abid Husain, Asia Publishing House, New Delhi.

1. *Mahatma Gandhi and Jawahar Lal Nehru P. 41. Asia Publishing House, New Delhi, India.*
2. *The emerging world. Jawahar Lal Memorial Volume. Linus Pauling P. 150.*

and the West. These, however have been local wars fought with traditional war materials. Even they have revealed how inhuman, cruel and beastly man can be. Fortunately there has been no major war during the last three decades and the human species is still alive. But what is the reason? Is it that man has grown in status and became a human being? Or is it the fright that the other is stronger or that such a war will annihilate both the victor and the victim? President V. V. Giri, inaugurating the week long seminar, on Relevance of Gandhi to our Times expressed this in a significant way by saying that mankind today depended upon "balance of terror between the super powers." Today there is the peace of terror. The choice before mankind is annihilation or peace. What can be the likely choice of mankind? Time alone can say. But important sections of world opinion do hazard the likely course. Jawaharlal Nehru for instance, pins, like Gandhi, his hopes on the human spirit.

He says "We are faced with a crisis in human affairs where either humanity survives or not. And this crisis can only be resolved, I think, finally not by some nuclear tests being stopped, but by something deeper, by the minds of men and the hearts of men and the spirits of men rising to somewhat higher levels. I believe that humanity will rise. It is my firm faith, because there is no other way. Otherwise it might perish."¹ Martin Luther King, the great American Negro Leader after studying various philosophies also came to the conclusion that non-violence is the only morally and practically sound method open to the oppressed people in their struggle for freedom. He says, "Gandhi² was probably the first person in history to lift the love of ethic of Jesus above mere interaction between individuals to a powerful effective social force on a large scale. Love, for Gandhi, was a potent instrument for social and collective

-
1. *The Anti-Nuclear Arms Convention*. P. 44, *Gandhi Marg*, June 1962.
 2. *Stride Towards Freedom* P. 91, *The Montgomery Story* Martin Luther King, Victor Gollancz Ltd. London, 1959.

transformation. It was in this Gandhian emphasis on love and non violence that I discovered the method for social reform that I had been seeking for so many months. The intellectual and moral satisfaction that I failed to gain from the utilitarianism of Bentham and Mill, the revolutionary methods of Marx and Lenin, the social contract theory of Hobbes, the back to "nature" optimism of Rousseau, and the superhuman philosophy of Nietzsche, I found in the non-violent resistance philosophy of Gandhi. I came to feel that this was the only morally and practically sound method open to oppressed peoples in the struggle for freedom." Not only Martin Luther King, but many other influential world leaders, particularly those of the oppressed peoples are now using not only the philosophy of truth, non-violence, and love but the very language that Gandhi used. Albert Luthuli, the acknowledged leader of South African people states "I make it clear that we mean to cling to methods such as these, to non-violence, and we mean increasingly to use these weapons even against such tyrants as South Africa's present Government. This is not only a question of morality. As long as our patience can be made to hold, we shall not jeopardise the South Africa of tomorrow by precipitating violence today."¹ Again, we do not struggle with guns and violence and the supremacists array of weapons is powerless against the spirit. The supremacist illusion is that this is a battle of numbers, a battle of race, a battle of modern armaments against primitives. It is not. It is right against wrong, good against evil."² Some thinkers who "stand in awesome fear of the roar of jet planes, the crash of atom bombs and the unknown horrors of germ warfare" find hope only in the East, where the Sun of the Mahatma blazes."³ Not only the Browns, and Blacks or the oppressed but also many whites imbued with the spirit of human uniqueness and dignity feel the same way. Mr. Linus Pauling for instance says,

-
1. *Let my people go*. P. 219. An autobiography, Albert Luthuli Collins, London and Glasgow, 1962.
 2. *Ibid.* P. 229.
 3. Quoted in *Contemporary Relevance of Gandhi* P. 4.

"nations will now be forced to be moral, forced to give up the immorality of war and accept the domination of world law based upon morality and justice."¹

Individuals apart, the New York Times, the well known American paper perhaps gave expression to the common man's reaction to Gandhian values when it observed; "He (Gandhi) has left as his heritage a spiritual force that must in God's time prevail over arms and armaments and the dark doctrine of violence."²

The challenge that non-violence of Gandhi throws out to human spirit is: what is the worthy way of attaining peace? holding the "balance of terror" before a horrified mankind or faith and confidence in the spirit of man and his innate goodness? If peace is to be achieved, should it be through the ways of the brute or the ways of man? The Rev. Haynes Holmes of the Community Church of New York has most effectively and almost dramatically given the answer by asking "Atom Bomb or Mahatma Gandhi—which of them are you going to choose."³

One of the values that Gandhi advocated and practised is the development of self-restraint in all fields of life. According to him "civilization in the real sense of the term, consists not in the multiplication, but in the deliberate and voluntary restriction of wants. This alone promotes real happiness and contentment and increases the capacity for service."⁴ "In other words, plain living and high thinking should be the type of the highest form of social life."⁵ The west also accepts this point of view in principle, but in effect it has not

-
1. *The Emerging world, Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Volume.* P. 150.
 2. *Quoted in Contemporary Relevance of Gandhi* P. 4.
 3. *Quoted in Renascent Hinduism, D. S. Sharma* P. 196, *Bhartiya Vidya Bhawan, Bombay.*
 4. *From Yervada Mandir* P. 36, *M. K. Gandhi. Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad 2nd edition, 1935.*
 5. *Contemporary Relevance of Gandhi* P. 69 Ed. M.P. Sinha.

believed in and worked for the development of restraint. It has rather believed in and worked for unrestricted material affluence and even self indulgence. Man, as the apex organism, has the ability to explore and conquer nature and utilize it to make human life more comfortable and easy. He therefore, set out to conquer nature and in the process learnt to conquer the weaker sections of humanity also. This gave him a kind of a dynamic, attitude to life and its problems. He became more scientific more aggressive. This enabled him to add new dimentions to human thought in science, industry and technology, physiology, sociology etc. All this created a new faith in human ability and human intellect. The results have been incredible in almost all aspects of life. It has led to unparalled affluence in many parts of the world.

But what has been the cost that man and nature have had to pay for this affluence. Exploitation of land has been so extensive that its reserves are fast getting exhausted. As a consequence it has become necessary to exploit rivers, lakes and seas. All this has resulted in pollting water and created fresh hazards for life in sea as well as on land.

The leading marine scientists have warned the world that "instead of 140 millions sq. miles of sea water, swarming with fish and plants, our land masses may be surrounded with stinking soup compounded largely of sewage oil and chemicals and industrial waste and radio active affluence."¹ Many species of life, not less than 1000 in the ocean have already died out during the last 50 years. American Oceanologist, John Cooper explains this phenomena. He says "there have been two ways in which modern technology has helped to kill oceans. Firstly we have used them as dumping for everything from nerve gas to isotope. We have smothered the surface with oil and spread the land with pesticides and insecticides. Rain washes these chemicals out of the earth into the rivers; the rivers dump them in the sea. Life on land utterly depends upon the oceans. If they should ever peridsh, it will be the end of life on earth."²

1. *Sunday Standard*, December 27, 1970.

2. *Sunday Standard*, December 27, 1970.

Discussing the ways of environmental control in a Conference in India, strong views were expressed by experts from many countries in regard to the need to control this environmental problem and the need to bring about a balance between man and nature. This trend of thoughtless exploitation of natural resources, it is argued, would force nature to kick back in such a way that the very survival of humanity would be endangered. Academician Eugene Fyodorov, Chief of the Hydrometeorological Services of the USSR said that the unscientific utilization of natural resources and pollution of the vital elements of air and water is going at a speed that it may soon be difficult for mankind to reverse the destructive process that it may start. The important question that it raises from the Gandhian point of view is : Is this unrestricted exploitation of nature necessary and moral ?

Dr. Rajindra Prasad, Ex-President of India and one of the closest disciples of Gandhi has a firm answer to this question. He says "the world's greatest need today is that man should learn to use with restraint the tremendous power he has acquired over the forces of nature. He must develop this power of self-restraint."^{1(x)}

1. *Legacy of Gandhi* ji. P. 86 Rajindra Prasad, Shiv Lal Aggarwal & Co., Ltd., Delhi.

(x) Mrs. Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of India, addressing the United Nations Conference on Human environment said, "Modern man must re-establish an unbroken link with nature and with life. He must again learn to invoke the energy of growing things and to recognise, as did the ancients in India centuries ago that one can take from the earth and the atmosphere only so much as one puts back into them. She then quoted the hymn which runs as follows :

What of thee I dig out,

Let that quickly grow ever,

Let me not hit they vital, or they heart."

From Atharva Veda. The Hindustan Times. June 15, 1972.

Another aspect of this value pattern is the unrestricted use of industry and technology, again for achieving material affluence. The industrialised nations have certainly become affluent. America is said to be the most affluent and most industrialised nation today. Prof. Ludwig von. Bertalanffy has given a very graphic picture of what influence science and technology has produced on Americans and their value pattern. He says "Ours is the affluent society, so we read, and we have the highest standard of living ever achieved. We are bombarded with astronomical figures of Gross National Product—20\$ billion for the first trip to the moon¹, 11\$ billion for packaging wares to make them appetizing to the buyer. But we also read of 100\$ billion which would be required but are not available for slum clearing; we read that 57 percent of people over age 65 live on less than 1,000\$ in cold water flats; that 10 percent of Americans are functional illiterates. And what is perhaps the most remarkable symptom; economic opulence goes hand in hand with a peak of mental illness, some 50 percent of hospital beds being occupied by mental patients. It goes hand in hand with a continuous increase in the rate of crime, especially juvenile delinquency. And, the psychotherapists tell us, beside

-
1. *The actual amount however, spent on Apollo 11 has been of the order 24 billion. This, however, does not include 392 million for project Mercury and 1.3 billion for project Gemini.*

Rajagopalachari the elder statesman, scholar and the first Governor General of India also has a similar firm view on this question. He says, "Man is endowed by nature with senses. The senses give him the power among other things to find pleasure in life and incentive to life. The human animal unlike his brothers in the dumb world is inclined to overdo the use of his senses under the pleasure derived therefrom. Civilization seeks to curb this tendency and put it down. Civilization in the true sense of the word is the development of restraint."

Our Culture P. 213. C. Rajagopalachari, Bhavans Book University.

the classical neuroses caused by stress, tension, and psychological trauma, a new type of mental sickness has developed for which they have even had to coin a new term—existential neurosis, mental illness arising from the meaninglessness of life, the lack of goals and hopes in a mechanized mass society.”¹ The great biologist feels disillusioned and asks, “Why has life become devoid of meaning and goals at a time of affluence and high standards of living, whereas it apparently had meaning and goals in times incomparably poorer in their economic and technical resources”.

“The best answer I am able to find is that complex structure of symbols and values, called human culture, is, besides many other things, an important psychohygienic factor. If man is surely a creature seeking satisfaction of his biological needs—food, shelter, sex, an amount of security for his biological and social existence—he also lives in the higher realm of culture which is defined by the very fact that it transcends biological needs. Tradition, status in society, full realization of potentialities, religion, art, science—these are a few of the needs deriving from man’s cultural existence. Starvation at this symbolic level leads to disturbances of the mental organism just as starvation at the biological level leads to disturbances of the physical organism. This is a well established fact of psychopathology”.² He is forced to the conclusion that the American Society is sick. “This diagnosis of the sickness is that it provides more or less abundantly for biological needs but starves the spiritual ones”.³

Another aspect of this lack of restraint has led some nations of the world not only to exploitation of nature and the weaker sections of human brotherhood but also the great inequalities in

-
1. *Problems and issues in Contemporary Education, An Anthology* Pp. 245-46. Scott Foresman & Company.
 2. *Problems and issues in Contemporary Education. An Anthology* Pp. 245-48. Scott Foresman & Company, U.S.A.
 3. *Ibid.* P. 248.

economic and social condition of the nations themselves. Some do not and in fact cannot have the minimum of human welfare, whilst some others have the highest imaginable prosperity. The picture was bad enough a decade ago. It is worse today. Pierre Mendes France described it as under : Today 85 percent of the world's wealth is held by 18 percent of its population. In other words, 82 percent of the world's population has to depend on only 15 percent of its resources. But the gap between new countries and the advanced countries is increasing from year to year."¹ The new countries are also industrializing and even if they advance at the greatest speed they can, it cannot be possible for them to catch up with the advanced countries. The inevitable result will be that even though the new countries may "develop", the differences in "standards" will continue. And since the developing countries are also getting industrialised the mental and spiritual "sickness" that it has brought about in the industrialised countries is fast spreading to those countries and similar problems are coming up. In India, for instance, we have already begun to experience the hazards of water and air pollution, our wild life is getting extinct. Crime is on the increase. "Taking the five year period from 1963 to 1968, the total number of cognisable offences increased from 658,830 in 1963 to 861,962 in 1968. Murders recorded a 30 percent increase over the five year period. Amongst 10,754 cases of murders in 1963 as many as 13849 were recorded in 1968².

Gandhian economic theory has specific answers to these questions. Gandhi believed that human wants need to be kept at the minimum and that a balance must be maintained between man and nature and that one should not act against the destruction of the other. His concept of progress lay, not in the multiplication and satisfaction of physical and biological needs of man but in his ability to develop restraints. He was not in favour of

1. *The Emerging World*. P. 106.

J. Nehru Memorial Volume, Asia Publishing House.

2. *Sunday Standard* October, 1971.

poverty and he struggled throughout his life to remove poverty from the face of India. "The picture of the crowd of men, women and children with their fleshless-ribs haunts me". or "No one has ever suggested that grinding pauperism can lead to anything but moral degradation.". He often said, he was out" to wipe each tear from each eye; or "to a people famishing and idle, the acceptable form in which God can dare appear is work and promise of food and wages."¹

But he certainly was not in favour of a philosophy where man did not place restraints on himself. His concept of standard of life was not in terms of standards which primarily emphasise physical affluence or biological permissiveness but in terms of human purity, truth and goodness. Addressing the students of Muir College he said "Ours will only then be a truly spiritual nation when we shall show more truth than gold, greater charity than love of self. If we will but clean our houses, our palaces and temples of the attributes of wealth and show in them the attributes of morality, we can offer battle to any combination of hostile forces without having to carry the burden of a heavy militia. Let us seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness and the irrevocable promise is that everything will be added unto us. These are real economics. May you and I treasure them and enforce them in our daily life."² His economics therefore, were simple. He believed in minimum human wants—minimum to keep the body and mind strong enough to function properly. He did not believe in the philosophy which has made technology and industry indispensable, creating more wants, supplying more materials and working for creation of more both at home and abroad. He felt that industrialism was responsible for the economic and cultural exploitation of colonial people. He was of the view that its unrestricted use will lead to further exploitation. "Industrialism "he declared "is, I am afraid, going to be a curse for mankind."³

-
1. *Young India*, October 13, 1921.
 2. *Speech to the Economic Society, Muir College, Allahabad, December 22, 1916.*
 3. *Young India* 1919-1932. 12-11-31. P. 355.

The ethics of Gandhian economics did not find favour with many. In fact, it has been said that his coming to the picture with all his "anti intellectual theories led the intellectuals in India to retreat into isolation."¹ Even his disciple, Nehru did not agree with him in this. And both Gandhi and Nehru were aware of it. Nehru says "It is true, I think, there is a fundamental difference between his outlook on life generally and what might be called the modern outlook. He is not enamoured of ever increasing standards of living and the growth of luxury at the cost of spiritual values. He does not favour the soft life; for him the straight way is the hard way and the love of luxury leads to crookedness and loss of virtue."² Gandhian theory of village self sufficiency and village economy or his opposition to large scale industry could not be accepted by the intellegentia. It was rejected on many grounds. Firstly "simple living and high thinking" or a life of "self-denial" was considered the product of "culture of scarcity." Secondly, ideas about cottage industry and programme of self sufficiency were not considered strong enough to stand competition created by the mass machine production. Above all, the intellectuals saw no conflict between the introduction of machinery and the ideal of good living. And Nehru was of the view that large scale industry need not create conflict "provided that machinery is used primarily for absorbing labour and not for creating fresh un-employment."³

And as soon as the Congress Government came to power, a serious effort was made to industrialize the country. Today we are one of the well developed industrialized nations of the world. We are repeating the west on the soil of India. Opinion on the nature and extent of accepting the western modes of thinking and behaviour in regard to science, technology, and other allied concepts is sharply divided in India. The great Indian saint and Seer Shri Aurobindo gave the warning in very

-
1. *Planning for Democracy* P. 55. A. B. Shah. *Manktalas Bombay, India.*
 2. *Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru* P. 111.
 3. *Ibid.* P. 113.

clear words. In a message to the Andhra University in 1948, he said "There are deeper issues for India herself, since by following certain tempting direction she may conceivably become a nation like many others evolving an opulent industry and commerce, a powerful organisation of social and political life, an immense military strength, practising power-politics with a high degree of success, guarding and extending zealously her gains and her interests, dominating even a larger part of the world, but in this apparently magnificent progression forfeiting its Swadharma, losing her soul. Then ancient India and her spirit might disappear altogether and we would only have one nation like the others and that would be a real gain neither to the world nor to us. There is a question whether she may prosper more harmlessly in the outward life yet lose altogether her richly massed and firmly held spiritual experience and knowledge. It would be a tragic irony of fate if India were to throw away her spiritual heritage at the very moment when in the rest of the world there is more and more turning towards her for spiritual help and a saving light." Not only saints like Aurobindo, but astute politicians like Rajagopalachari also had severe differences with this approach. Mr. Walter Crocker in his brilliant biography of Jawaharlal Nehru has stated that Rajagopalachari also feared that Nehru may, if he goes ahead with the programme, destroy "something most valueable" to India. He says "Rajaji may have been wrong in this or in that particular attack on Nehru Government, but he was not wrong in his divination that if Nehru succeeded, he would destroy something fundamental and something most valuable in India."¹ He states that as the programmes progressed and began to show results, Nehru started to have doubts at times about the direction he had adopted. He says "Towards the end Nehru seemed to have doubts at times about whether the direction he had set out might be as right as he was once sure it was. But it was too late."²

1. *Nehru. A Contemporary Estimate* P. 168.

Walter Crocker. George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London.

2. *Ibid.* P. 168.

The significance of Gandhian value pattern raises certain important questions ? Does the effort to bring about affluence through industry and technology really solve human problems ? Do the solutions to these problems lie in this kind of prosperity ? Could human effort be directed to find fresh answers to these questions ? Is there any need to place any restraints on human needs and therefore, on industrial production ? Does restraint on human needs really mean selfdenial ? And since Gandhi was not against technology and industry, but against the use we make of it, his value pattern raises other questions of a different nature. Can science and technology be utilised to develop a new concept of human prosperity perhaps in terms of a purer man, who is less irrational, less supersitious, less diseased, more healthy and more rational, more creative, more just, more loving, more human ?

One of the significant contributions of Gandhi to the field of values has been his concept of integrated life and mind. His whole life and its functioning has been an attempt to eliminate dichotomy of human mind and personality. Foreign scholars have accused the Indian of dichotomy and the Indian scholars have accused the west. The truth, however, is that man both in the East as well as in the West suffers from this dichotomy. Man speaks of peace and prepares for war; he talks of equality and works hard to perpetuate inequality; he speaks for the depressed and downtrodden, but creates new conditions to create new classes of the depressed; he speaks of non-exploitation but has created a pattern of economy that makes exploitation a necessity. Coming to humbler and simpler but harder truths man proposes to speak the truth but has created a social and economic pattern that make him helpless in not speaking the truth; he pleads for sacrifice and service to the other, but has bound himself by factors that do not allow him to offer service to others, instead he is constantly tempted to exploit them.

Man knows and believes that the individual writ large is the society but accepts different criteria for individual and social performance. Mr. K. G. Saiyidian one of the eminent Indian

Educationists believes that the dichotomy lies deeper in human power and spirit. He says "I believe the foremost global issue that confronts mankind today is the dichotomy between power and spirit, between the great things he can achieve, and the petty social vision which controls and directs his achievements."¹

To Gandhi goes the credit of making one of the most serious efforts in human history to remove or atleast reduce this dichotomy of the human mind. "Mens and ends are controver-
lable terms in any philosophy of life," said he.² "If truth is good, it must be adhered to whatever the cost; if human beings are equal, equality must be given whatever the consequences; if peace is good, it must be achieved through peaceful and non-violent methods, whatever the sacrifice; if it is a sin to kill a man by any individual, it must be recognized so if the community or an organised group like the army does it.

This absence of dichotomy was given a beautiful expression by Gandhi himself. He said "My life is my message." He did not lay much score by what man said, but by what he did. Today mankind is faced with great and difficult problems. There is the ever frightening prospect of cold or hot war; there is the insurmountable fear of one nation by the other; there is the clash of economic and political interests. And, there are a hundred other problems. But the hardest of them all is the dichotomy of the human mind. The importance of Gandhian efforts to reduce dichotomy and unite the idea of Ahimsa to the idea of activity has been pointed out by Albert Schewitzer. He says "The fact that Gandhi has united idea of Ahmisa to the idea of activity has importance not merely of an event in the thought of India, but in that of humanity."³ "It was perhaps

-
1. *Gandhi Marg*, January 1968. P. 81.
 2. *All Men Are Brothers*. P. 105. Krishna Kripalani.
Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad.
(*Indian edition of UNESCO Publication*).
 3. *Indian Thought and its Development* P. 234.
Albert Schweitzer, Wilco Publishing House, Bombay.

this fully integrated truthful, non violent life of Gandhi that urged, the great Scientist Albert Einstein to declare "Generations to come, it may be, will scarce believe that such a man as this ever in flesh and blood walked upon this earth."¹ The world perhaps would be a better place to breathe in and walk on if we could reduce the gulf between word and deed.

The implications of the Gandhian value pattern are many. But its main significance for the present day world is that it offers an alternative to the present way of life and its problems. What ails man today is not science or technology or their fruits or thorns but the way of life which forbids him to see any otherway of life. Gandhian value pattern offers a glimpse of this alternative.

1. *Quoted in the Essential Gandhi*, P. 369.

Loius Fisher, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London.

Chapter 8

Quality of Life and Education

Human behaviour springs from the quality of human life. And quality of life changes from time to time and nation to nation. It also changes in the same country, from place to place and time to time. It is generally believed that a quality of life has led man to work for peace, and a different quality of life, for war. Today it is said with obvious truth that man talks of peace and prepares for war. This contradiction in man's profession and practice also springs from a quality of life. If, therefore, man today or any day needs peace and growth, what should be the quality of life that he may develop and work for, is the most urgent question that he faces.

It would indeed be interesting to examine the quality of life of a nation and see the kind of behaviour it produced in space and time. But that cannot be attempted here. It is however, possible to point to a very few basic characteristics of the most recent ages namely the pre and post-technological and scientific age.

One of the characteristics of the pre-technological age, when time and distance were handicaps and not assests, was, that it gave birth to a variety of cultures. This was no mean achievement. The uniqueness and individuality of individuals or of communities or countries was maintained and developed and a rich diversity evolved. But for want of wider contacts, many of these cultures died out or grew in self-annathiating isolation.

In the post technological and scientific age, the danger of isolation lessened. But a far more deadly kind of danger emerged. The rich variety of the pre-technological age got

steamrolled. The physically more powerful cultures utilized all human ingenuity, all tools of death and disaster to erase the differences and raze down the rich cultural variety to dull uniformity. All this was and is being done in the name of taking "civilization" to "uncivilized or undercivilized or under developed peoples and countries" !

During the last two to three hundred years the most dominant ideologies have been the ones developed by the west, the U.S.A. and the USSR. These ideologies today rule supreme, not only in these countries but in almost all countries of the world. The quality of life, the world over is naturally shaped and formed by them. Popularly these ideologies are known as capitalist democracies and socialist democracies. There are vital and fundamental differences between the two, but basically they are the same.

Both believe in science and the development of scientific temper, in technology, in industry and their unlimited use ; they believe in the exploitation of man, animal and the nature—all for the pleasure and comforts of man. Both believe that man must work, cultivate science and technology ; produce and consume goods and work for the production and consumption of more and more goods and services.

Consequently a "good individual is one who continuously seeks to increase his work load—produce more goods and services. Hard work and the decision to increase one's share of society's rewards is a sign of respectability, security and good citizenship. In this "view, the central purpose of human life is to maximize one's effectiveness as a competitor and to merge one's individuality with the system."¹ If we look at this system from a distance it becomes clear that its dominant values are self centeredness and greed. Historically, the economic, political and social philosophy that emerges from it has led these nations to conquer weaker countries and communities, convert

1. Jack L. Nelson. *Radical Ideas and the School*. P. 95 Holt Rinehart and Winston Inc. New York.

them into colonies, exploit them for purposes of business and for raising the standard of life of their own people and so on. It continues to lead them to find all means and methods to find new markets and increase their per capita G. N. P. or standard of living. While it has helped in reducing inequalities in some ways, it has caused tremendous inequalities, not only amongst nations but also amongst the communities within a nation. The disparity for instance between the per capita G. N. P. of an exploiting or developed and the exploited or the under developed countries ranges between USA 2, 572 to \$ 57 Burma.¹ And the disparity in the per capita annual income of a state within a country, say, in the case of India between Rs. 526 for Maharashtra and Rs. 299/- for Bihar. It is no wonder therefore that 85% of the world's wealth is held by 18% of its population. This means that 82% of the world's population has to depend upon only 15% of its resources².

Again, this philosophy has led man to exploit nature in the most reckless manner. This ever increasing demand upon the essentially limited resources of the earth is creating hazards for life itself. The thinking world therefore, is feeling concerned about the problems that the unrestrained exploitation of nature is creating for the very existence of man. Some feel so despondent as to ask if this is not the nature's way to get rid of the nuisance that man is.³

An aspect of this philosophy is that it has given an incredible affluence to most countries of the West. Today man in these countries virtually has many more amenities than kings and conquerors of the past ever had. Today he has and can provide any or all facilities for his physical needs and aspirations. But has

-
1. *Education, Manpower, and Economic Growth*, Frederick Harbison and Charles and Myers, Mc Graw Hill Book Company, New York, London '64.
 2. *The Emerging World: Jawaharlal Nehru*, Asia Publishing House Volume—P. 106.
 3. *Toynbee. Arnold.*

this affluence given him satisfaction or peace or has it improved the quality of his life and behaviour? It has not. Why should in the affluent countries of the world, at the peak of their affluence, there be deterioration in mental health and why is mental sickness or crime increasing? To crown it all, why should depressing events like the watergate affair happen at the highest level of the most affluent country?

The Impact on the Developing Countries including India.

For the developing countries, the west is a worthy model—a land of scientists, administrators, politicians, economists, sociologists, philosophers and above all, a glamorous world of wealth and power. If the developing countries wish to develop, as they must, the rails are laid and the models are available. Developing countries must develop as the developed have done. The logic is simple. If an individual in a developed country has all the amenities he needs, or wants, why should an individual in a developing country not have? If each American family has a car now and plans to have two in the coming years, why should not an Indian or a Chinese family not have? If the per capita G. N. P. of U. S. A. is \$ 2572 why should the G.N.P. of Burma be only \$ 57; why not as much, if not more? Naturally therefore, there is a race around the world for repeating in each developing country big or small, what the west has attempted and achieved. Each must, therefore, cultivate science and technology and undergo the process of modernization, so must we in India. Today for all practical purposes we have adopted this system. The meaning that science or technology or industry or economics has in the capitalist or socialist democracies is the same that it has for us. Per capita G. N. P. today is as important to us as it is to an American, a Russian or a Japanese.

The cultivation of this philosophy has begun to yield the fruit it bore in the west. A section, though small, of the people have begun to enjoy comparative affluence at the cost of others. We are fortunately not in a position to exploit other nations, but we do exploit each other. Greed and thirst for power are fast becoming our coveted values. These are now the main

springs of our conduct. Today "a good" Indian is one who produces more, consumes more, works for more and more production and earn more and more profits. A good medical practioner is one, who is highly qualified, charges high rate of fees and is available more and more, not to those who need his services most, but to those who can pay his fees ; a good engineer is he who may work hard and efficiently, but who is an adept in ensuring his personal gain and of all those who are connected with his work, irrespective of the quality of work that he may produce or the ideological objective he works for ; a good business man is one, who is clever to make his ware more and more appetizing, earn higher and higher profits, utilize all difficult occasions to earn the highest profits without regard to human needs or quality of his ware. The businessman today produces goods, not because he wants to produce the commodities the country needs but because, he wants to earn more and more. A good household is one which aspires, not for a good simple, graceful but an extravagant and glamorous life. We have also started exploiting nature, our forests and forest life is poorer today than it ever was. We are building huge and rather unmanageable towns and cities, we are converting green-fields into abhorning slums. There is increase in the rate of crime including tuvenile crime. The rate of increase in crime is greater than the rate of increase in population. In Delhi alone, the rise in crime has been 57% during the last 10 years. In the age group 12-17 years the rise during 1967-71 has been as high as 177%. We have lately been hearing that the cream of our young people, the college students, are progressively taking to drugs and such other habits. In the intellectual and mental world we continue to be "imitative rather than innovative."¹ Recently the Prime Minister, Smt. Indira Gandhi also gave expression to this depressing feeling. She said "Despite twenty five years of political independence as a nation; we continue to be intellectually diffi-

-
1. Kaul G, N. *Imitation or Innovation ? Experiments and innovation in Education, National Council for experiments and innovation in Education, Bombay.*

dent and culturally imitative. The process of economic development seems to have inhibited rather than encouraged the earlier yearning to have our own distinctive path."

Human spirit fortunately has a unique quality of asserting itself on suitable occasions. The process has started. Thinkers in many parts of the world including India have begun to ask whether the concept of the quality of life, does not need an alternative definition ?

The Responses

This situation has given rise to various responses which have not yet crystalized themselves. However, the following are discernable.

(a) The West Based

One response emerges from the thought structure and thought process generated by the capitalist and socialist philosophies. It affirms that the basis for developing a new world should be no other than this. According to this, it is of overriding importance to provide every human being with work and facilities that modern science and technology can provide. It pleads for lessening poverty, reducing inequalities and differences between man and man. Its basic belief is that poverty, or inequality or differences could be removed by supplying more goods and more services. Quality of life therefore, depends on removing poverty and inequality by providing a decent minimum of food, clothing, shelter, health, education etc. What this minimum is, it does not define. As it is, the minimum for America is \$ 2572, for Burma just \$ 57 and India \$ 73. The question so obviously stands abegging.

(b) The Developing Countries Based

Another response is determined by the conditions and cultural patterns of the third world. It sees in the scientific, technological and economic thought patterns of the west inherent seeds of violence, inequality, injustice. Has not this philosophy led the west to embark on an unprecedented conquest of weaker sections of humanity all over the world, brought about what is now known as colonial rule, exterminated many a cultures

and imposed upon the world monotonous and deadening one way of thinking? Has it not, on the continent of the west, led to inter-state wars and killings for the sake of getting more power and more materials from the weaker world? and is it not still spending 7 to 10 per cent of its G. N. P. over producing instruments of death. They attribute not only the inequalities and lack of economic and social justice but also the political hatreds and jealousies as well as various political philosophies to it. They believe that the earstwhile wars and today's exercises in political detente between the major powers are only different aspects of this acquisitive philosophy. Are they not exercises in maintaining power, where it is and poverty also, where it is? The fact that these countries are anxious to spend 7 to 9 percent of their per capita G. N. P. on the preparation of materials of war, but are not prepared to raise their aid to weaker countries from '5 to '7 to 1% of their per capita G. N. P. is indicative of the extent to which this philosophy can evoke human sympathies. The basic philosophy of the acquisitive society is the perpetuation of inequality, economic and social injustice. However much they may talk about removing poverty or economic and social injustice or helping the developing countries to grow, the inherent quality of this philosophy would just not allow it to happen. They, therefore, feel convinced that the world stands in need of a different philosophy which gives a new meaning to existing concepts and permits to look into the possibilities of a fresh approach to life style.

The position of the developing countries in this regard is most confusing and self contradictory. They hate the colonizers for having exploited them and yet they are in a haste to follow their example and adopt the same philosophy which helped the colonizers to exploit them.

This confusion or contradiction is strengthened by a number of factors. Some of these are :—

(1) There is a natural urge amongst the peoples of these

Jack L. Nelson. Radical ideas and the schools P. 67 Holt, Rinehard and Winston INC, New York.

countries to examine their own cultures which have suffered indignities at the hands of conquerors and see, if there is anything in them which they could use or on the basis of which they could enrich their thought or life style and develop a distinctive individuality.

(2) There is a vague feeling that it is easier for the developing countries to conceive of a new world and a new quality of life because they are now on the look out for a progressive approach to life. The developed nations, they feel, have already set their ideas and cannot see beyond their own ideologies. Besides, they are now in an advantageous position. They exploit the weaker world and any change in this situation will affect them adversely. Therefore, they are not psychologically prepared to bring about a new world. The developing countries are interested in this change. The impulse for a better world and a better quality of life needs to come from them. They must, therefore, boldly reject this philosophy and experiment with a new one.

(3) The affluence and glamour of the developed countries however, is much more attractive than these dry desires and abstractions. After all, their own civilization and culture has not given to them what the western has to the west. They virtually have all they want and can get all that they may desire. Why, therefore, should they not work for such a life pattern. But this is not easy.

Examining the practicability of this ambition, they inevitably face questions like, the rate of growth of each nation; the availability of resources in men and material, the availability of know-how or so on. The existing position is that the developing countries, by virtue of their being under developed, have a lower rate of growth. It has, for instance, been estimated that on the basis of the existing rates of growth, India can achieve the present position (1967) of American in about 300 years. So about other countries.

This position creates a difficult situation. On the one hand they wish to improve their economic position as quickly as possible, on the other, they have the shortage of resources, the absence of know-how. Thus the most needy nations who ought

to develop most quickly have to develop most slowly. On the other hand those nations which are comparatively better off are able to progress it at a higher rate. This phenomena is sure to develop into a very explosive situation in the years to come. Whether this happens or not, the philosophy is definitely not conducive to a balanced growth of human personality in the different parts of the world. For the under developed countries it is a compulsion of aspirations, doubt, inability and helplessness.

(c) The Indian

The third approach was attempted in India by Gandhi. India under Gandhi's leadership developed the image of a society where there would be no high or low, where one man would not exploit another, where one country may live so that it may serve another and so on. Gandhi did not believe in poverty. In fact he devoted his entire life to work in the direction of reducing poverty in India. Yet, he did not believe in or work for economic affluence which would be gained at the cost of another man or the nature. In fact he said that if you have more than you need, you are a thief. This in effect meant that India would be neither richer nor poorer than any other country. This is a profoundly new philosophy and applied to the existing world situation, it would in effect mean that no country has a right to be richer or poorer than another; no country has a right to be more educated or better informed than any other and so on.

The New Essentials

What then should quality of life mean to a man today. There is no dearth of qualities that one could list for attributing to an ideal quality of life. Great teachers and literatures of the world have from time to time discussed and preached the desirability of cultivating them. Each age has striven to cultivate some that were considered as the most suitable. Our generation also needs to focus attention on such qualities as are, from the present point of view, needed as a corrective to the existing thought pattern. These could be :

A World view

A characteristic of the civilization and cultures of the ages gone by is that each developed in an isolation forced upon it by

the lack of those factors that have shortened space and unified time in the world of today. The result was that the nations of the past, including India as well as that of the west developed civilizations and cultures which are exclusive. In India, for instance we developed like an accomplished introvert. We gave birth to a culture, a way of life which in itself was comprehensive, wide and deep, but it was not aware of what the neighbours were busy about. The result was that our gigantic effort was an exercise for developing an imbalanced value pattern. We hoped, we were developing a mental and spiritual life but in the process overlooked the development of a balanced personality. And we had to pay heavy price for it continuously for hundreds of years. Time and again we faced ruthless and occasionally barbarous attacks of newer and newer hoards of physically stronger people. In the history of man this has happened not only in India, but elsewhere also. The highly cultured Athenians were over run and conquered by the physically stronger Romans. Later, science and technology made the west physically and materially stronger. It developed a wonderful culture, yet an exclusive one, an unbalanced one, due again to the same reasons which made the Indian an exclusive one. We need to take note of this significant phenomena of human grown into account when we consider its future development. Therefore, in any attempt we may make now, we need to consider issues relating to culture or civilization or the quality of life, not from the exclusive point of view of a nation or a group of nations, but from the point of view of mankind as a whole—a world view. We do need to take into account, what our neighbour is doing. And today all nations of the world are, for all purposes, each others neighbours.

Universal and not national

Man has very narrow loyalty. He has built strong and impenetrable walls around him. He cannot look beyond his own limited surroundings. He belongs to a community or a nation. He has shed blood to preserve this loyalty. Thanks to science and technology, these impregnable walls have become pregnable. He can now see beyond his community and his country. Human sympathies are indeed larger today than they ever were. This is a happy trend.

Man is by birth universal. In fact literatures of some countries address themselves not to, say an Indian, but to man anywhere on earth.¹ This literature knows no geographical limitations ; infact it cuts accross them. When we talk of man the universal we do not admit inequality or injustic of any kind ; we rather accept man as equal to man. There can exist no high or low individual or nation ; one nation cannot exploit the other. It will be a world where we shall talk of man, not of nations, of the brotherhood of man and not the garrison of the powerful. Since inequalities exists, nations will work not to intensify but to reduce these. Gcndhi anticipated such an era when he said ' we want freedom for our country but not at the expense or exploitation of others, not so as to degrade other countries. I want the freedom of my country so that the resources of my country might be utilized for the benefit of mankind. My love therefore, of nationalism or my idea of nationalism, is that my country may become free, that if need be, the whole country may die, so that human races may live.'²

Not self-love but self-transcendence

Individuals and nations today are in a state of narcissism or self-love. The most civilized and modernized individual or nation today is the one which is most self centred and is good or bad to others to the extent that his self interest demands. Its programmes of aid or foreign policy or postures of peace or war are all meant to help in the objective of this self interest. What the world needs today is not, only self love but also self-transcendence. An individual must be able to go beyond his own self, to the other. Today we have an acquisitive—competitive society. we want to acquire more and more at the cost of both man and nature. We want and are proud of being at the exploting or acquiring end. If we want to bring about a world where peace can reside, we have to think and act in terms of self-transcendence. Self-transcendence or more appropriately renunciation is not a state of poverty or of giving away but

1. *Literature in Ind.a is addressed, not to the Hindu or the Indian, but to man any where on earth.*
2. *Gandhi in the Indian Village P. 170 Mahadev Desai : S. Ganeshan, Triplicate, 1927.*

an attitude of mind. It might sound preposterous to advise the developed nations to renounce their wealth or power in favour of the developing nations. It might also sound preposterous to ask a poor country like India to renounce whatever it has in favour of a still poorer country. In the case of a poor country like ours, it also looks equally strange to say that there is anything to renounce. These questions are indeed very inconvenient because they stand against our self-interest. But the truth is that if you have more than your neighbour has, you have got it at his cost and you owe an obligation to him. There is nothing preposterous about it.

Self-restraint

To talk of self-restraint at a time when a whole humanity seems to be out to free man from inhibitions of all kinds, may look like taking the clock back to the middle ages when human behaviour was governed by all kinds of restraints, including self-restraint. Man has, after hard struggles, succeeded in reducing inhibition and bringing about a sort of permissiveness. This has enabled him to overcome his weakness and conquer nations. In fact permissiveness or indulgence has become the new value. The root of this new shift lies in the philosophy of an acquisitive society. Since there is no end to human greed, there can be no end to his desire for indulgence. And since it is unrestrained it has created hazards which threaten the very existence of man. This passion for a glamorous today has, for all purposes, blinded us to the needs of tomorrow. Therefore, if humanity wants to live, indulgence must come within limits and be replaced by restraint. Civilization according to many is not indulgence, it is restraint. Significantly it is humans who built up civilizations and not animals who enjoy the greatest degrees of indulgence. Should therefore, the cultivation of restraint not be considered a desirable value in human life. "Civilization" said Gandhi Ji "in the real sense of the terms, consists not in the multiplication, but in the deliberate and voluntary restraint of wants. This alone promotes real happiness and contentment and increases the capacity for service."

Duties and rights

In an acquisitive society, self interest is the most dominating factor. If my primary interest is self, I need to be aware

of my rights. And so, in the present day world context we are all very aware of our rights—individuals as well as nations. An average worker, labourer, clerk, administrator or a mill owner, each is aware of his rights. A worker must get the maximum emoluments, he may not produce as much ; a mill owner must get the maximum production, he may not pay as much. We must get, we may not give. This has created a big chasm in human behaviour. But if the emphasis changes from self-love or self interest to love for the other, duties become more important. This infact, was Gandhi's view also. "The true source of rights" he said "is duty. If we all discharge our duties, rights will not be for to seek."

The tolerant truth

It is trite to say that man should believe in truth. But as soon as you ask "what is the truth?" truth becomes as elusive and suspect a word as religion. Man and nations have too often asserted that they know the truth and have shed human blood to prove that they know it. Humanity has suffered pain and agony, not because man does not know the truth, but because he knows it. In truth, truth has been an intolerant God. Fortunately, truth in India has not been as intolerant. It has always believed in the truth of the other man also.

The acceptance of this intrepertation of truth has given India one of her greatest assests—a catholic temper and a sense of the appreciation of the "other truth." It has made possible the present concept of a Secular Government, an invaluable possession of the modern Indian. What is much more important is that this concept of truth has inherent in it the ability to enable man to see truth in his own way of life as well as in that of others. It facilities self-transcendence. What we need is the tolerant and not the intolerant, fascist truth.

Tolerance

Toleration is a virtue with us now because we have become intolerant. But as we saw earlier, the word is a negative term. What we need to have is not just tolerance, but an active appreciation of the other man's belief, his truth.

Integrity of human personality

A quality of the human personality has been its dichotomy

of mind both in the East and the West. Man, whatever his position or profession, speaks one language and behaves another. This dichotomy has its roots in the philosophy of self love. If and when giving and not receiving becomes the philosophy, dichotomy looses meaning. Dichotomy can be reduced in proportion to the cultivation of self-transcendence. Men have done it at all ages and in more difficult and barbarous times. In our own days Gandhi did it. He demonstrated through being what he professed through word. His life, indeed was his mission. In the India of today, if there is a need to cultivate any single virtue at once, it is integrity. The more we say about its absence today, the more disgraced and fallen we feel.

To give a list of qualities considered necessary for cultivation is perhaps, one of the easiest things one could do. As stated earlier, man has known these qualities and values of life all through his living memory, yet we know that the cultivation of even the most important ones did not succeed beyond a certain point. Gandhian value pattern, as we all know, had the potential for improving the quality of man and yet, it did not succeed beyond a point. This was due to many reasons. But one of the most important reasons was that India, alone, could not go ahead with it in the face of other powerful systems of value which were simultaneously invading India from abroad. This phenomena indicates that in the new context of the world, where time and distance have been annihilated, no ideology, however basic in nature or however glamorous and powerful can succeed by itself. The world has come to a situation where mankind has to be viewed as one. It is no longer possible to conceive of a value pattern suitable for one section of humanity only. We need to think of man as one or universal and design a value pattern on that basis.

And this raises the important questions: given a value pattern, how best can it be achieved and lived? The problem that mankind faces today is, therefore, two fold what are the most suitable values and how best can they be achieved. Both are highly complex and difficult questions. No single individual or institution can provide the answer. In fact, as we have seen above, no single nation or even a group of nations have so far

been able to do so. We therefore, need to recognize that many approaches need to be made to find answer. One of the most effective and perhaps permanent answers can be through the process of education, again, not by any one individual or institution or nation. We need the will, the experience and the wisdom of all nations, of all mankind for doing so. It is therefore necessary that a number of exercises be made all over the world in close collaboration, to devise and develop a new system of education to answer these difficult questions. This is not difficult. The atmosphere and means required for such exercises are available today more than ever before. At the theoretical and even the methodological levels, many educational problems receive world wide consideration. The UNESCO, for instance, has been devoting time to examine and explain new slogans like life long education or informal education, and if there are problems which go beyond these methodological improvements or changes, they are bound to receive much more attention. And when we talk of quality of life, we do ask some very fundamental questions? Education or even life long education or informal education for what end? Should humanity devote its time and energy to providing informal or non formal or life long education, once again for purposes and objectives which have made human life what it is? They suggest that whatever the scheme, humanity must be clear about its objectives as humanity. They therefore, talk of Education for Mankind. Behind these exercises, lies the urge to go beyond the existing philosophy of life and practices of education to something nobler and more elevating. Too long has man devoted its energy to achieving what are essentially trifles and pleasantries of life—the near primitive human aspirations. The time is ripe that it ceases to do so and begins to direct it for achieving a higher level of aspiration—a better quality of life and devise a suitable educational system to achieve it.

APPENDICES

Text of the letter which sought reactions to the paper on moral Education in India.

Dear.....,

I am herewith enclosing a paper on 'Moral Education in India'. I have raised certain problems in this paper and would very much like to have your views on them. I would not like to focus attention on any of the problems but would prefer to have your views on any that strikes you as important or controversial. Nevertheless I would bring the following questions to your notice ;

1. If you are of the view that schools can teach moral education, how best can it be done in the circumstances now available in the country.
2. If you are of the view that a moral re-generation of the country is essential for successful moral education how best could that be done.
3. If you are of the view that moral regeneration of the country is a continuous process and should go on simultaneously with the efforts of schools, how best can this be done.

I would be grateful if I could have your reactions as early as possible.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,
(G. N. Kaul)

Extracts from reactions received to "Moral Education"
(Chapter 4)

1. Sh. Acharlu K. S. — Secretary, Nai Talim Samiti, Bangalore—3, **Mysore.**
2. Sh.,Bhatt Moolshankar M. — Lok Milap Trust, Bhavnagar, **Gujrat.**
3. Sh. Desai Jyotibhai — Gandhi Vidyapith, Vedchi, Surat, **Gujrat.**
4. Sh. Diwakar R. R. — Gandhi Peace Foundation, **New Delhi.**
5. Sh. Dube K. U. — Principal, Govt. Training Instt. Bijalpur, Indore. **M. P.**
6. Sh. Gupta L. D. — Director, State Institute of Education, Chandigarh.
7. Smt. R. Kanthimathi — Director, State Institute of Edudation, Madras—34.
8. Sh. Kar B. C. — Head of the Department of Education, Gauhati University **Assam.**
9. Sh. Maitra S. S. — Principal, A. C. Training College, Jalpaiguri **W. Bengal.**
10. Sh. Munshi K. M. — Late President, Bhartiya Vidya Bhavan, Chowpatty, **Bombay.**
11. Sh. Paliwal S. L. — Lecturer, Vidya Bhavan G.S. Teachers College, Udaipur, **Rajasthan.**
12. Sh. Panigrahi D. — Principal, State Institute of Education, Bhubaneswar, **Orisa.**

13. Qureshi Begum M. — Director, State Institute of Education, Srinagar, **Jammu and Kashmir.**
14. Sh. Ramchandaran K. — Director, State Institute of Education, Bangalore—4, **Mysore.**
15. Dr. Salamatullah. — Principal, Teachers College, Jamia Millia Islamia, **Delhi.**
16. Sh. Shukla K. K. — Professor of Education, A.G. Trg. College, Ahamadabad, **Gujrat.**
17. Sh. Sharma Srinivas — Director, State Institute of Education, Allahabad, **U.P.**
18. Sh. Thankar G. S. — Principal Govt. College of Education, Bilaspur. **M. P.**
19. Sh. Tirtha K. V. — Department of Post-Graduates Studies in Education, Bangalore University.
20. Sh. Trivedi R. S. — Principal, M. B. College of Education, Sardar Patel University, Vallabh Vidyanagar, Gujarat.
21. Mrs. Vir mani S. — Principal, Govt. Co-Education Institute, Daryaganj, **Delhi.**
22. Dr. Vyas J. P. — Principal, Government College of Education, Khandwa, **M. P.**

APPENDICES

K. S. Acharu,
Secretary, Nai Talim Samiti,
Bangalore-3.

1. I am of opinion that we should distinguish between moral education and moral instruction. What some schools are imparting is not moral education but instruction.

2. Science and technology, as the paper has pointed out, have brought about both good and evil. The paper presents the correct perspective of the relation between technology and spiritual welfare. We have in it a deep analysis of the achievements of science and technology and the corrupting influences of today's world, the contradictions in social relations and politics, the fall in norms in private and public life, the defiance of religious tradition by youth, their worship of false heroes and the loose unorganized living—all these reveal the absence in their life of anchorage in values.

3. Moral education including a programme of work would help in the cultivation of moral qualities. The activities suggested in the paper will undoubtedly contribute to the development of moral values, if they are properly planned. The programmes lose their character the moment they are dictated to from above. /

4. Whether the school influences society or society influences the school is an insoluble eternal question. Indian tradition shows that the ancient seers of the tapowana were the progenitors of social and political dharma. Even the mightiest emperors bowed before the wisdom of the seers and saints. Even today such a thing is possible provided there are a few hundreds of institutions working under the guidance of men and women of self-control and wisdom, free from interference by the State. Standardization is the order of the day.

5. The paper anticipates difficulties in imparting moral education. The gulf between theory and practice exists in all fields of life, and it is no wonder that schools have also their share of it.

6. The modern schools have the objective of preparing youth for leadership in society as well as for participation in society's various functions. If we assume that the schools and teachers carry on the activities conscientiously, we may hope that the students who come out of the portals of these schools will spread the fragrance of their character all over society. Good education has the inherent vitality in it to revolutionize society. Nai Talim, as Gandhiji envisaged it, did promise the dawn of a new social order.

Replies to the questions raised in the letter.

1. I would interpret "moral education" in the most expansive sense so as to identify it with "religious education." I have pointed out in my paper the necessity for Religious Education", not religious "instruction." To "teach" moral education appears to me to be an impossibility, since moral or religious education is an integration of knowledge, will and action.

2. A moral regeneration of the country is certainly necessary. History shows that every political revolution places before the country the concept of a new social order, which it strives to bring about. In our country Gandhiji tried to work towards a new social order based on freedom, equality and non-exploitation, and suggested new deal in education to achieve it. If the principles and programmes of his new education had been sincerely and faithfully implemented, the social scene would have been, to a considerable extent, different from what is today. Instead of working towards this end, our political leaders offered welcome to western technology and industrialism and made the country a slave of the American dollar. And more dangerous and soul-killing was the borrowing of the American ideas of the

post-sputinik educational establishment, as if indigenous thinking in education was non-existent.

Society today is swayed by American ideas of affluence and ease and it needs a mighty effort to re-orient our people to ideas in tune with our culture and social conditions. It can be effected, if at all, by a new faith in values and a new education. Vinobaji is attempting to bring about a social, economic and moral revolution in society through his gramadan movement, but the odds against his programme are mighty. If the educational system of the country can co-operate with this movement, there is some hope for a better world.

3. The moral regeneration of the country is a two-pronged integrated process the school and society both working in cooperation to achieve it. But the more fundamental and practical process is to bring about a revolution in education. What we are doing today is just 'reform', adding a few periods for subjects in the time table, modifying the courses of study, increasing the percentage of marks for a pass and so on. These changes do not contribute to the creation of a new society. In my paper I have suggested a few methods for orienting our education.

The entire educational system—its basic foundations, curriculum, organisation, administration—should be oriented towards realising the basic values of life. Call it what you will, religious education, moral education, value-based education or, Nai Talim.

.....

Moolshankar M. Bhatt
Lok-Milap Trust,
Bhavnagar (Gujarat).

After my pretty long experience as teacher I have come to hold that moral education should be woven in the entire academic programme. It can not be taught as a separate subject in schools. By presenting before students life-stories of spiritual leaders, or by making them chant from religious classics, we may easily feel satisfied at having done something worthwhile, but it

can never be the real solution to the problem of 'Moral indifference.'

In fact the seeding of young minds with morality depends entirely on the extent to which the whole process of education becomes living, joy-giving and one which provides an outlet for the spirit of adventure in the young and which creates bonds of affection between the teacher and the taught. Morality is a positive view-point. It cannot be a dry code of 'dos' and 'don'ts'. It should find a clear reflection in the student's ways, means and activities aimed at livelihood.

But, to our misfortune, the process of education, its administration and administrators as well as the wider administrative machinery of which it is a part, all these prefer to stick to the old dead path. Talented teachers have become cynics, and the second raters and mediocres professionals. Today politics has become a profession. Benefit to one's own self or group or at the most one's own area has become the only incentive for most people. Wider interests of the society should have been a major incentive for any activity and this should have been considered the measuring rod of morality. But there is a widespread lack of this basic morality today. You have rightly pointed out that with such a state of affairs all around our youngsters should not be different from what they are. Nevertheless, we should not abandon our efforts to impart moral education to our children. Teachers with understanding and idealism can always do it. If they cannot, who else can ?

.....

Jyotibhai Desai,
Gandhi Vidyapith,
Vedchi, Surat.

Let us not runaway with the idea that India as a whole had a time when things were entirely of different order. .

The "SALT OF THE EARTH" constituted by a very small minority of men have always given succor and light to the human race. Neither in the times of Gandhi nor in the times

of Buddha did we have an enmass understanding about what they lived for. It is wrongly assumed that people at large were different. There were enough people who worked against their ideals. In spite of them they succeeded as Christ did through his crucification. We want the tribe of such men to increase. But, let us not ever feel that the entire people will reach such heights of moral life. They succeeded not because people held them in respect. But, they through their life and work provided the human kind with examples of some the noblest of achievements possible for every frail human being. They never waited for the entire society to change.

The common man derives his satisfaction from the lives of people that are the "Salt of the Earth." He, himself may not succeed in living upto them. He cannot assert, nor does he quarrel. He lets other misbehave. But in times of crisis the citizen of free India has effectively demonstrated his devotion to his country—1962, and 1965 and now 1971 are the years to remember. In this connection, with a deep sense of confidence and pride. The country was atonce alert to its danger and was working with one mind on each of these occasions. Therefore, there is no occasion to loose faith in the wisdom and devotion of the man in the street. His tolerance for the misbehaviour of 'election heroes' need not be understood as a sanction for all their misdeeds. The country will rise and has given proof of its wisdom in the seventh decade which was pronounced as the most dangerous one.

What we read in the newspapers in mostly misleading. The newspapers are interested in things that are unusually sensational. The efforts to achieve all that has been achieved by United States of America, very often has never been fully represented. So with many other countries. Public morals are what they are. The earnestness of a western man and his efforts to achieve what he wants are indeed of a very high order. So to conclude that the western world is to-day on the precipice of utter failure and moral bankruptcy, will be a newspaper conclusion. Not that they have no problems, but that they are honest about declaring them and their attempts to

grapple with them are more worthwhile than we can ever think of.

Last years 'Reith Lectures' by Frank. F. Darling on evolution are worth reading. He says "Why not look upon human sexuality as something that is potentially uniquely human? Presumably, the feather of a bird were first developed as a form of insulation against heat and cold. Feathers as a means of flight were an entirely different development, but they still continued to serve the function of insulation. A third entirely different function has developed in the patterns and colourings of feathers which have become a means of recognition and of conveying signals, as in display and in the near unison of action in a flying flock. The other functions remain, nevertheless. There is nothing teleological about this, of course, just natural selection upon existing natural equipment. I think human sexuality should be looked upon this way; while its first function was that of an adjunct to reproduction, this is not necessarily its final one."

He proceeds further giving example of sacred love between lovers. This he holds, "Love as part of the expression of human sexuality is the added human function, which the act holds above and beyond human reproduction." Having further considered the fears of dangers of 'freedom' being available because of contraceptives, he says "Leave them (adolescents) with the examples of parents in love." Love full of devotion. Love and compassion are the spiritual forces which give us a positive view of human sexuality. "Kill a Mocking Bird—" is a novel about a conscientious father. His effort to educate his own children so that they may live always looking straight in the eye of their father. It received the "Pulitzer Prize". It was for 94 weeks on the best-seller-list. It was read and bought by millions of Americans. It has been translated into 10 other languages. People in west are interested in honest hard labour and a healthy moral standard.

Considering the above views, I would rather prefer to have an open view and work harder to achieve mature understanding of human behaviour.

Views about Moral Education

I hold the view that "moral regeneration of the country is a continuous process and should go on simultaneously with the efforts of schools."

The school should not function as an isolated island. Multi-polar activities to regenerate the society initiated by the school will form a good basis for the desired change.

The school should be a real functional democracy. The students should be helped to achieve a real sense of self-discipline. An atmosphere of freedom and discipline is the most essential negrediant of a sound moral education. Simplicity and self-controls are the necessary Indian goals in the moral field. And the students should experience this level of living.

.....

R. R. Diwakar.
Gandhi Peace Foundation, Camp,
New Delhi.

I have your circular letter dated 12th June. There is no doubt that moral education, or I would call it ethical education, is absolutely necessary right from childhood.

Do not the parents convey to their children not to tell a lie, to tell the truth, to be honest and so on ?

But I would not like to complicate ethical education or moral education with any philosophy. That will land us in regions from which it would be difficult to come out. I would, therefore, emphasize that ethical principles and ethical virtues are social in character. Even one, who doesn't believe in metaphysics or philosophical principles, can well be a highly ethical person because he thinks that if one is to live a social life, he has to go by certain principles of conduct towards each other and towards property.

Apart from Gandhiji's theism, belief in God, and so many other things, his ethical principles can be reduced to very simple formula.

For instance, man and his relations with all sentient beings including man himself, should be based on the principle "Do unto others what he would be done by."

Man's relationship with property should be on the basis of being a trustee of properties, possessions and material on which one has control.

Regarding Man's relationship with woman, it should be of equality ; a friend, a companion, a mate and one whose rights and privileges are equal to those of man himself.

If this simple and straight way of looking at things is developed, we can well land on simple principles of ethical conduct.

These principles will be quite capable of being conveyed to the children in primary schools and students in high schools and colleges.

I would like to learn from you your reactions to what I have suggested.

.....

K.U. Dube, Hony. Principal,
Geacher Training School,
Bijalpur, Indore (M.P.).

Let me congratulate you, first of all, for giving serious thought to the problem of moral education in our country. We highly appreciate your free, frank and realistic review of the present circumstances in relation to moral education to be imparted by the school.

As you have mentioned the forces other than school have an adverse and some times disastrous influence over the young generation and as a result, the school has become comparatively ineffective.

Yet, schools should take up the responsibility. The content of moral education may be interwoven very naturally with other subjects. The content of moral education should include basic human values which are universal everywhere and do not invite any controversy.

It is also true that moral regeneration of the country is essential. This could be done by laying down certain codes of conduct for all-politicians, social workers, doctors, and administrators, business men and teachers. What is much more important is that the code should be implemented with faith and enthusiasm. Apart from this, selection of teachers should also be made on certain basic qualities and not only the minimum required educational qualifications. Similarly tests like aptitude tests should be universally introduced.

.....

L. D. Gupta,
Director, State Institute of Education,
Chandigarh.

I am intimating below the comments as desired by you.

1. (i) It is not possible for the schools alone to teach moral education to the younger generation unless the homes, the Churches, the press, the film, the television and the radio are not geared to work in this direction.
- (ii) Moral education viewed as traditional religious education or traditional ethical education has no place under the present conditions (political, social, economical, scientific and technological).
- (iii) The schools can, however, make effective contribution in this crusade.
- (iv) Exemplifying good citizenship behaviour will yield better results than ritualistic sermonising.
2. (i) Moral regeneration of the country is a must to save the indian society from disintegration.

- (ii) Schools have an important part to play in this regeneration.
 - (iii) It would be necessary to review and improve political and administrative life of the country. That, indeed is a difficult job and will need the cooperation of all.
 - (iv) Business and professional life shall have to be cleaned up. This does happen during a period of emergency and should be possible during peace time also.
 - (v) Unless the elders set examples of good behaviour the young will not react to the sermonizing of the old.
3. (i) Moral regeneration of the society through cleaning up processes from above and citizenship education of the younger generation in the schools, should go hand in hand.
- (ii) Unless strong movements are initiated from the top as well as the bottom there is no hope of change for the better. Change for the worse will continue to take place in the absence of any efforts to halt it and to set the ball rolling in the opposite direction.

.....

T. M. T. R. Kanthimathi,
Director, State Institute of Education,
Madras-34.

I consider that every school has to take up the responsibility of imparting moral education.

✓ The three social institutions that shape the moral development of the child are, Home, School and Community. It is very necessary for the school to enlist the cooperation of the parents and the public to secure the wholesome growth of the child in morality. But the influence at home and the religious institutions is waning. The school therefore, has to assume a greater share of responsibility in training the children.

To give effective moral training the intellect must be linked

with the heart. Any kind of formal instruction will not appeal to finer emotions as these emotions must be exercised in action of one form or another. But the school by its organisation and methods of instruction can do much for the development of responsibility and positive morality which leads to "doing good".

School can give moral education by two ways: One is by providing moral instruction as it obtains in our State. Moral instruction consists of teaching precepts and ethical principles. In Tamil there are plenty of such ethical works written to suit children's level-Vakkundam, Nalvazhi, Naladiyar, Thirukual.

Moral Instruction can be given through stories from Ramayana, Mahabharata, Panchatantra, as well as from the life of Ramakrishna, Jesus, Buddha and others.

But the more effective method is to give direct example to children and place them in real social and moral situations where they get opportunities to exercise moral judgement. This involves the child in a real social and moral situations.

Yet another effective method is the example that the teacher can set. Students in schools are at the formative stage and feel impressed by good models, i.e. teachers and parents. In the present condition I am of the view that the moral regeneration of the country is very essential. The school should attempt to give whatever best it could. On no score can school shirk its responsibility of providing moral education to children.

.....

Professor B. C. Kar,
Head of the Department of Education,
Gauhati University.

Read the paper on "Moral Education in India" by Dr. G. N. Kaul and it is painful to note that the writer has referred to some of the new developments in the sphere of morality in different western countries without supporting them by any authoritative work on the subject and it is difficult to accept all the propositions incorporated in the paper. I would particularly point to the reference which he makes to "new

values" in homosexual life, experiment with group marriage, sex fair in Denmark etc. The new concepts like the group marriage as referred by the writer seem to have been as old as the Mahabharata of our country and these things were experimented but later on discarded by the society on the ground of building up the concept of marriage on a sounder psychological basis. These cannot be accepted universally. Further the example of the innocent child telling the visitor "Dady says he is not in" cannot be universalised and the morality of every home in our country should not be decided on the basis of some such instances.

I feel our country does not lack in a well thought out philosophy and there is no-confusion in our Philosophical outlook. We have accepted the democratic ideal of life and we encourage the cultivation of democratic virtues in our homes, schools, colleges and other social institutions. Cooperation, sympathy for one-another, fellow-feeling, respect for individuality etc. are some of the fundamental moral virtues which can be taught and practised in academic activities of the school without enchroaching upon the religious sentiments of pupils.

.....

S. S. Maitra, Principal,
A.C. Training College, -
Jalpaiguri, West Bengal.

I was just despairing that our elders have taken the life-membership of a society of hypocrites when your very candid discussion in your paper on 'moral education in India' drew my admiring attention. I am sure your efforts are diagnostic and not curative. For, we are not the persons who can either stall or cure this gigantic death-drive of the species homosapiens.

Let us first sense the problem. What are moral values in the present-day world? As educationists we know that starting philosophically from Idealism we have come (up or down ?) to Existentialism through Humanism, Realism, Naturalism, Pragmatism and a host of other views. Probably Materialism is the ruling concept now. This concept clashes not

only with spritualism but also with moral values. For matter can have no morals. Our material content is never subject to any moral principles. The problem would therefore, have been simpler if we were all material. But, Unfortunately or fortunately, we are material plus something. This something is where morals count. We have, however, been ignorant of the nature of this 'something' in spite of our eternal quest. Philosophy has possibly been a quest of this extra something in man, nature and the creation. Religion is applied philosophy which caters [to the needs of man and his society. Hence religion held its sway since the existence of man. We have now agreed to abolish religion but have not yet been able to arrange for a substitute which may look after the well-being of man and his collective living. In fact we have brushed aside the enquiry altogether to make things too simple. In my view this over simplification has led to the present misery. There must be some other custodian (let it be science instead of religion, if it dares so) for the most turbulent steeds in the stable. I fear, I am trying to be abstruse.

A very simple question may, however, be raised in the context of your enquiry. Morals or no morals, do we want to exist and exist as social beings? Simple existence has certain essential pre-requistes-food, shelter, dress, sanitation and possibly money. Work, leisure, pleasure and a host of others will follow the first requirements. Social existence has some other set of essential pre-requisites. It is not difficult to define these pre-requisites as moral values. For, moral values prescribe the methodology for human inter-relation; a relationship that will lead to the betterment of social conditions and ensure peace and happiness for the individual. Therefore, if we agree that we have a desire to exist as social beings we must also pay due attention to the mechanics of social existence which is enunciated in moral values.

You have pinned too much hope on schools. I cannot think of them in isolation. They are just part of the decadent society we are living in. Moreover, the prestige suggestion that could

come out of the school and its teachers is a matter of the past now.

Therefore, when we speak of regeneration, it must be an all-inclusive programme, the home, the society, the individual, the leader, the politician, the state, in a word, the whole country must be involved. It will only be ostrich philosophy if the shapers of the country's future indulge in their usual go-as-you-please arm-chair politics and sermonise the educational set up to better the prospects for them.

There must be wide campaigning on the values that we want to establish. Convincing arguments with practical demonstrations should be given for establishing these values in the minds of the young impressionables. For instances, let us take the example of the sex-explosion that you have enumerated in your paper. Hunger is one of the passions least amenable to reason. All the three aspects of hunger i.e. hunger of food, hunger for sex and hunger for wealth are equally recalcitrant. But, fortunately, there is still another overwhelming passion. This is the passion to exist and grow. We may start our reasoning from this fountain-head. Dealing with sex, for instance, we can first convince people with medical reasonings (not Mary Stopes) about the evils of overindulgence. Promisuous relations may come next from the genetical, psychological and social stand-points. When the scare has set in, we can talk of the merits of self restraint (our olders did it that way but we have forgotten it). Our Family Planning experts could do it that way to assist our programme. Unfortunately, however, they are towing the western line—enjoy without responsibility. They are not speaking of their own tried method of 'enjoyment through restraint'.

I must end here and attempt replies to your queries :—

(1) Schools are no longer effective tools for emanating new ideas. Their only care is to look after percentage success in public examinations.

(2) Moral regeneration is essential. But this is no longer

possible without adopting the lines of the politicians. We must introduce a mass movement through a hand of devoted and selfless workers.

(3) As already stated, schools may for the present be left out only as certificate producing machines, (The certificates may come through any method desired by the students. Recently the question of allowing books in examination halls is engaging our serious attention as the invigilators are being scared for fear of life.)

The task of moral regeneration will not be automatic, rather the degeneration is going to be automatic. This work must therefore, be entrusted to some other morally strong and suitable agency.

Though we are secular, we must know that moral principles draw their sap from the soil of religion. Religion is not a set of rites, rituals, totems, taboos in any of the sects—Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Buddhists or Christians. It is the summation of the applied principles in all the sectarian beliefs which enunciate in clear terms the mechanism of blissful living, alone and in company of others. Our word DHARMA has this connotation. This concept of Dharma, the binding force within a society, must be revived through people who have a mission and not through us who work for some gains.

.....

Shri K. M. Munshi,
Late Bhartiya Vidya Bhavan,
Bombay.

You correctly reflect the dilemma, and shall I say confusion, in which the modern man finds himself in the present crisis in character which is not confined to our country, nor indeed to any particular age-group.

Let me begin by saying that there can be no two opinions on the paramount need for imparting moral and spiritual education, even in the present context of scientific and technological advance, secularism and modernism. Differences however, can

arise only as to the method and the stage at which one should begin imparting such education.

I am afraid I cannot share your pessimism that moral ethical or spiritual education in schools will be hypocritical or ineffective in the face of what is happening in society. The admitted denial and even repudiation of moral and spiritual values by the adult society is surely justification for such education, not for its helpless abandonment. Nor can I agree that truth, honesty and similar virtues are relative. Luckily for us, India by and large, has not slid from her way of life or her traditions in the sense that the West has fallen from grace.

I am clear in my mind that we should make a beginning with the teen-ager right now.

Man needs for his all-round development both material and moral food, science as well as religion; otherwise his growth will be unbalanced. The younger, the better for its start.

India is respected by the world, not for her material or economic greatness, but for the loftiness of her thought. Her civilization has lasted for five thousand years while others have disappeared. The vitality to her teachings has proved imperishable. In seeking to propagate those ideas to her own sons and daughters we are on legitimate ground.

As I see it, the following in a nutshell constitute the basic features of the Indian way of life or moral thought or whatever you may call it.

1. 'Tyaga' or self-denial is the corner-stone of Indian thought in contra-distinction to the acquisitive nature of society in the West.

2. Contentment or peace of mind is the objective sought to be attained for the individual through the above means.

3. Truth, Courage, Love of God and Men, in fact of bird and beast too, at the individual level, are natural impulses.

4. Marriage is a sacrament and family life is a social obligation.

If these basic Indian values of life could be brought home to its citizens, young and old alike, much of the evil we witness today may be eradicated. At any rate they are a necessary ballast to the present scientific temper.

There need, however, be no doubt that teaching of these values may not have the desired result. Gandhij's is a shining example. He did teach precisely those things. There is no reason why the people's response and receptivity should be lacking now, provided the approach is rightly made.

At present the young generation has no means of knowing the very existence of these values, let alone learning them, either at home or in the school in the present scheme of things. Let us not digress on the way of it, but try to give a fillip to this effort in all earnestness.

This could be done, in my view, by prescribing, for supplementary study, graded and well-produced readers from the infant class upwards—readers which contain stories from Puranas, Panchatantra, Hitopadesa, Jataka, Upanishads, episodes from the lives of saints and sages of all faiths, historical figures etc. illustrating these values. The young ones after grasping these fundamental ideas will, when they grow older, be in a better position to judge for themselves what is good when confronted with complicated problems without becoming cynical as they do now.

Secularism should not be narrowly interpreted to mean as irreligion. Rather it should help understand and appreciate the good points of all religions and promote catholicity and tolerance in the young ones.

Two periods in a week with minimum marks prescribed for a pass will do the trick.

Even if it does not change all the students, it will certainly help reform some of them, which is better than none as at present.

.....

S. L. Paliwal,
Lecturer in Education,
Vidya Bhawan Teachers College,
Udaipur.

In your paper you have very aptly drawn our attention to a very important problem of education today viz., "The Moral Education in India." We agree to what you suggest there in that moral education for the young is meaningless unless there is a programme of moral education for the grown-ups also.

We feel that the first thing to be done in this connection is to redefine moral education in clear and precise terms. The teachers as "*Behaviour Designers*" will be able to perform their job in a better way if they know in precise terms as to what elements constitute Moral Education.

Truly speaking, to talk about moral education is very easy, but to put its programme into action is really difficult. We have seen through all these years that mere verbalization about moral education is of no avail and that it is high time now to give up the strategy of verbal behaviour and to take to an action-oriented strategy. We have had enough of it by now and have seen the futility of it. We also have full conviction in the truth of the saying that morality is caught and not taught. So there is a need for an atmosphere of morality inside the educational institutions and outside them, as in the community at large. The atmosphere can materialize only when the teachers and other workers in the institutions practice morality in their own lives and the institutions they work in. The school library, the play-ground, the morning assembly and such other co-curricular activities may prove very significant means to that end.

But what is more important is that the Head-master and the staff give a lead in creating an atmosphere of morality in the school through their inter personal relationships and with the students and the community at large.

It is, therefore, essential that all the formal and informal agencies of education, namely, the family, the school, the community, the state, the religion and other means of mass media play a constructive and cooperating role for the cultural regeneration of the country. The inter-institutional cooperation is very essential and the school should play the coordinating role for them all. We agree that it is an up hill task, but to my mind, there is no other solution. The youth of today stands in a state of mental bewilderment because of a number of meaningless statements of our political leaders and the teacher will have to come to their rescue through his constructive and comprehensive programme of education with moral education at its core. A vicious circle has set in but it shall have to be broken at the school level. If there is a *programme of moral education in schools*, planned more or less with the spirit suggested above, it will work as a shock-absorber in the total process of education and, as a result of it, the new generation is likely to develop cultural moorings without which we are finding ourselves without anchor today.)

.....

Shri D. Panigrahi, Principal,
State Institute of Education,
Bhubaneswar, Orissa.

Educated persons who engage themselves in immoral acts are fully conscious of what they are doing and they feel in their heart of hearts that their actions are not supported by the moral code. Nevertheless, they do it because the sense that helps them to distinguish right from wrong is not strong enough to keep them away from the latter.

It is a fact that values are changing in course of time and also from place to place and culture to culture. Still there are certain absolute values like truth, honesty, sense of duty and responsibility which hold in all ages and in all places. Once these absolute values are taken care of, others, which may be viewed as relative, will take care of themselves.

The next question is where to start. Social regeneration is

a slow process and change cannot be easily attributed to one or two factors. Nor even a time limit can be fixed for it. So the only place to begin with is the school.

.....

Begum M. Qureshi,
Director Training & Principal,
State Institute of Education,
Srinagar.

I have gone through the paper prepared by you on moral Education in India with great pleasure. The paper is lucid and thought provoking. You have very well brought out all the influences which weave a web round the youth of today and deviate him from the right path. Surely moral education is the need of the day and we have to think out ways and means to do something in this direction. I agree with you that the school, community and the nation should give moral education by practice and not by precept. My personal view is that moral education should not be based on religious education as it will create a sense of sectarianism.

It is also a fact that science is the important requisite of today but science without belief in God becomes a tool in the "hands of the satan in man" but even the scientists have in the sub-conscious mind belief in God. Recently when Appollo-13 astronants got in trouble, scientists as well as the rest of the world resorted to prayers and invoked the help of the Almighty for the safe return of the spacemen back to earth. Even the Hippies who come from the land of plenty, luxury, and comfort are not satisfied with materialistic values but roam about in search of transcendental meditation in the company of saintly men like Yogis and others.

The world is experiencing a value turmoil and this is having adverse effect on our student community. The school and the community therefore, have a responsibility which they cannot shirk.

.....

K. Ramchandra,
Director, State Institute of Education,
Mysore State.

I feel the advancement of Science and rapid industrial development in the world has produced a revolutionary change in the outlook of modern society especially the western society. This has been lucidly put forth. The various examples given are all factual without any tinge of exaggeration. But, the paper would be invaluable and self-contained, if positive suggestions for solving various problems of effective implementation of Moral Education in India under the present circumstances were included. Probably, this will be done after the consensus is available to the specific questions you have raised in your covering letter.

Replies to :

Question 1. I hold the opinion that the schools can teach moral education; as without moral education a school curriculum cannot be complete and we will be denying the coming generation an important factor of our culture—a sense of values. The following are some of the possible ways of teaching moral education in schools :

(i) The text books and supplementary readers should contain a good number of biographical lessons on illustrious personalities and saints of the world, focussing attention on their moral and social traits.

(ii) The teacher's personality will have a direct influence on the moulding of moral character of pupils. Hence, it is necessary that while recruiting teachers, ways and means of selecting such persons as have the minimum qualities required to make him a satisfactory teacher are devised. It may be a difficult task in a scheme of mass recruitment. But at least some effective screening should be done. Minimum educational qualifications should not be the only a critrion. This is being done in the army.

(iii) Some regular periods may be prescribed for moral teaching.

(iv) Salient features of all religions, without any bias towards any particular religion, may be discussed during the usual periods. Pupils may be encouraged to read religious books, and make compilations of good thoughts.

(v) Stories with or without morals from world classics should find a prominent place in text books.

(vi) Cultural activities and observances of days should be arranged more seriously with definite educational and moral objectives and with systematic and well-planned follow-up work.

(vii) Arrangement of excursions to religious places of all denominations, Harikatha and Purana programmes, lectures by saintly persons, etc., also will go a long way in promoting moral education.

(viii) Prayers of a serious nature well-planned and executed should be a regular feature of the school time table.

(ix) Situations like 'lost and found', confessions, open-shelf libraries, unsupervised examinations, house systems and students' courts, are effective ways of promoting moral education.

(x) Role-playing and dramatisation of events having high moral bearing, done by pupils themselves, will greatly influence moral education.

Question 2. The school cannot be isolated from society. Society has a continuous and powerful influence on the education of the child. So, moral regeneration of society i. e. the country is quite essential for moral education. But, moral regeneration of the country is an uphill task. It cannot be effected within decades or even in a century. A continuous and constant effort on the part of the government religious bodies and social reformers will prove highly effective. The Parliament, the Court, the Church and mass media like the stage, the radio, the temple, the press, the T.V., the film should also be utilized constructively and effectively. What however, is most important is that the heads of the society should set good examples by

action. One of the objectives of education is to build an integrated personality and cultivate qualities like honesty, adjustability, courtesy, manners, sobriety, bravery, creative thinking, a spirit of adventure etc. Serious effort in achieving these qualities can bridge the gulf between the moral and material worlds.

Question 3. Moral regeneration of the country is a continuous process and it should go on along with the efforts of the school. Mass moral education as explained above and school moral education are always the two faces of the same coin. One without the other will not have the total effect. Therefore, the Government should have a two pronged policy with one eye on the mass and the other on the school.

.....

Dr. Salamatullah,
Principal Teaches' College,
Jamia Millia Islamia,
Jamia Nagar.

I have gone through your paper on Moral Education in India with interest. The issues you have raised deserve attention of all those who are interested in education, in general, and Moral Education, in particular. To my mind Moral Education is not a thing to be doled out in prescribed doses through a formal teaching programme. In spite of so much talk about Moral Education these days both from the educational forum and on the public platform, very little serious thought has been given to specifying and concretising the concept of Moral Education. Attention of all those who feel concerned about this aspect of education is invited to this crucial matter.

I am happy that you have given some thought to this problem. Unfortunately, I have nothing to say on this subject just now.

.....

K. K. Shukla,
 Professor of Education,
 A.G. Teachers College,
 Ahmedabad.

It is true that the question of imparting moral education has remained unsolved so far. The adoption of a secularist policy determines the attitude of the state towards religion, religious education and secularism. The constitution guarantees certain rights which include the right to practice and propagation of religion and the right to freedom subject to the rules of decency and the principles of morality. In my opinion no serious attempts have been made to define this attitude very clearly, interpret it and draw its implications for education.

The question therefore is :

1. What is the meaning of secularism for us ?
 —is it an irreligious or an anti religious attitude ?
 —is it the outcome of a negative attitude towards religion or a positive faith of life ?
2. What is the meaning of the democratic ideal for all of us ?
 —if Democracy recognises the value and worth of every individual in the society what guiding principles have been evolved in order that we might achieve the goal ?
3. What is the meaning of life in the context of modern world with its scientific and technological advancement ?
4. If the development of human being is the goal of International Education, can we say with any certainty that it is attainable in the existing conditions and the prevailing situation in the world ?
5. Are moral and religious education inseparable ?
 Can the school not teach morals without placing them in a religious context ?
6. Can secularism give full meaning to life and become a vital force for all of us in India and for the people of the world ?

7. If morality is the basis of life rooted in practice can school impart moral education in isolation of intellectual studies ?

The questions raised here speak of the views. The article as I have understood it, raises some of the questions regarding this aspect. But I have a feeling that it mixes up the issues of moral and character education with religious education. The relation between the two must be clearly drawn.

It is also not clear what meaning secularism has for us.

The school has given little thought to this aspect of education. Moral education is an inseparable aspect and the school should play a definite role and not put the blame on others for its failure. 'The school must accept this role and responsibility in the up-hill task of moral regeneration of the country.)

The school and the educationists should not play second fiddle to politics and political leaders.

The debate on this issue will be interesting and fruitful.

.....

Sriniwas Sharma, Director,
State Institute of Education
Allahabad, U. P.

The need and value of moral education cannot be over emphasized in our country today. In the past, the question of imparting moral education could never have been a serious one because the Indian way of life and its social set-up were such that a child learnt initial virtues like goodness, truthfulness, honesty, upholding the right and so on, right from the cradle. The religious sanction strengthened the whole out-look, and ethical conduct was a natural 'must'.

In the changed world of today, the question of imparting moral education to the children at school deserves most careful thinking, planning and implementation.

It may be conceded that youth has a right to challenge authority and take nothing for granted. The 'values' of yesterday

have little bearing on or sanctity in the apparently economy guided and technologically progressing march of huminity. The 'short-cut' method of individual progress is the one that pays. But in accepting this we are by no means in a position to assert that this 'negative' state of life can sustain Indian culture or enrich the country's vitality so that it might live in freedom and honour. If the old values have been debunked, what values should now be inculcated in our younger regenerations so that they too might attain a coherent, satisfying and purposeful pattern of life. And how ?

In view of the rampant indiscipline in our country and of the student community in particular, it is not advisable to wait for a moral regeneration of the country as a first step. No amount of strict legislation and pious persuasion can be of effective use in a matter like this. The best thing is to make a beginning at the schools where as the saying goes 'we can catch them young' The 'home' is the right place, but we can only reach it through the school.

Any system of education worth the name must aim at developing the entire personality of a child. i.e. shape his mind, body and character. Character-formation is the most crying need in a country like ours since it is passing through a stage of transition. It is through moral education that the formation of character in the right direction can be brought about without delay.

As suggested above, mere pious talk or platitudinous preaching will be of little avail. We should not talk of Absolute virtues but decide upon a few practicable yet solid qualities of character. The child should be made to imbibe these desired virtues without feeling that he is being 'taught' some meaningless precepts. The following list of desirable values, by no means complete, may highlight our line of approach :—

1. Cleanliness
2. Dutifulness
3. Respect for elders
4. Uprightness of behaviour

5. Devotion to work and *no wasting of time*.
6. Loving kindness towards youngers, aged and weak persons.
7. Tolerance
8. Honesty
9. Fairness
10. Protesting against badness
11. Firmness
12. Hopefulness
13. Sincere awareness of the common good.
14. Patriotism.

This may be implemented in the following manner.

(1) Only those persons should be employed as teachers whose character, behaviour and outlook may be worth emulating.

(2) Reading and telling of inspirational stories and folk tales of all religious and races—this material also be made available in the form of picture books, dramatic performances and cultural shows. If the story of Harish Chandra could so profoundly affect young Gandhi, that of Subhas Bose or Napoleon may very well shape the heart of a potential national hero.

(3) Cinema, telecast, radio broadcast etc. It shall be readily conceded that the visual appeal is clearer and more lasting. To-day cinema is the most popular and far reaching medium of mass appeal. Unfortunately its cheap crime and sex stories have undermined the ever cherished virtues held sacred by the Indian society. If not the only source, it is probably the most evil one that has bred lust for gambling, killing, robbery, sexual perversions and gangsterism. It is too late to try curbing its popularity or recreational value. But if we cannot ban it we can ourselves harness it to our service by producing pieces of moral appeal just as at present we prepare feature films and documentaries. Radio and television also can supplement this approach. However, more time and carefully planned programming would be required. Items should be designed to teach students the essential elements of a good,

clean and purposeful life. The visual image may be expected to form an indelible image upon the mind as well as heart and last one's life time.

(4) Scouting, Junior Red Cross, Youth Hostels, Cultural Festivals, Team Games :—The value of such activities can never be over emphasised. In fact they develop such qualities of body, head and heart as last through life. Absolute virtues like Goodness, Truth, love etc. can and should be attained through situations in corporate life and not through mere religious fables. The above mentioned activities give birth to loyalty and leadership, tolerance and truthfulness, courage and calmness, co-operation and helpfulness, sportsmanship and hopefulness—these virtues are as good as any that have ever been preached and practised. They are of this earth, solid, honest and practicable.

(5) *Religious morality :*

India is a secular state but does not instruct Indians thereby to become irreligious. Religion may be supplanted by scientific rationalism, but the religious way of life can and will always hold good because it aims at peace, love and godliness qualities that shall ever be eulogised. Children at school must be told what the true spirit of all religion is : there is absolutely no harm in exhorting them to follow the real teachings of their religion bearing upon human life in a modern secular state. The example of truly good teachers professing different faiths will mould boys along the right path. Incidentally, that would bring about national integration.

(6) *Activities meant to inculcate love of India.*

And lastly, the historical perspective of our country should be so presented in the text books that the school-going child must not fail to learn the most important lesson i.e. loyalty to motherland. Patriotic fervour is weakened by fissiparous tendencies like communalism, linguism, regionalism or loyalty to foreign nations like Pakistan, China, Russia or America. On the one hand past history should be so re-presented in books and the curriculum that it does not fill a children's heart with hatred, on the other more emphasis should be laid on the

cultural, and not mere political, side of Indian history. Students must be told that they can hope to live only if the country exists in honour and freedom. Acts of patriotism should be awarded glorious national recognition even as treason deserves swifter and more palpable punishment in our country. National Anthem and Bande Matram may also be sung in suitable regional versions.

.....

G. S. Thakur
Principal
Govt. College of Education,
Bilaspur (M. P.)

While appreciating your ideas on moral education I have to say as under.

1. No, we are firmly of the opinion that moral education cannot be taught but good moral habits, can be inculcated in the child through right approach during his stay in the school.

2. Yes, a moral regeneration of the country is essential for successful moral education. It can be done when there is a real awakening in the society. We and our leaders need to accept that that moral behaviour of the Indian society has reached a low point. It is only this realisation which can impel us to regenerate the society through all possible channels including the educational institutions. Unless there is enough consciousness of this felt necessity at the top i. e. among leaders of the country, nothing substantial can be done at the lower level. When the whole fabric of Indian society has been effected by the absence of morals, to do something at the school level to regenerate it, will be merely tinkering with the problem.

3. In the present atmosphere of education, there is very little scope for freedom of action on the part of an individual institution. Granting that moral regeneration of the country is a continuous process, regeneration depends on those who call themselves makers of destiny of the nation. Unless these destiny makers give full freedom to education to mould itself as

it likes, it will not lead us any where. We firmly believe that even today every thing percolates from above. In every walk of life, it is the behaviour of the destiny makers which lays down the standard pattern for the lower strata of society. Unless political leaders, public servants and adults of the society work within a certain code of conduct, any efforts of the school will be of no avail. Whatever little can be achieved by education, will be undone by the unfettered, unethical behaviour of the society at large. Hence there is need first to repair the society in its behaviour before anything concrete can be attempted at the school level.

.....

N. V. Thritha,
Department of Post Graduate
Studies in Education,
Bangalore University

My observations or comments on the discussion of the problems you have taken up in your paper are as under :—

1. The conflicting situation has been presented very clearly by you throughout the paper. On the one hand the hypocrisy of the generation preaching high moral values as also the sea of hypocrisy beneath the imposing pose of modernism found in the youth of today are both well brought out.

2. It is also true that the age old controversy between the spiritual values and the material ones has been fast disappearing. I agree with you in the important point you have made that the new faith is that the spiritual and material values can and must fuse. The difficulties of today arise out of the pattern of values found in people of prestige; in their behaviour on the one hand and the noble concepts of morality on the other.

3. The important aspect of evaluating the impact of these voluntary efforts has to be thought of in advance to see that at least no damage is done and that some suggestions for improved methods can be found by experiment in due course.

4. Religious institutions or associations should not be entrusted with this task because it is more likely to lead to casteism and narrow fanaticism.

5. It is better to call it "Ethical Education" rather than moral and spiritual education, because the latter term almost becomes synonymous with religious education.

6. Different patterns of pilot projects have to be undertaken before finalised programmes are implemented on a large scale.

.....

R. S. Trivedi,
M. B. Patel College of Education,
Sardar Patel University,
Vallabh Vidya Nagar, Gujarat.

Man is morally suffering, but we are now aware of and concerned about it. We do not at present have scientific data about moral organization or disorganisation. From overt behaviour we have come to hasty generalization; We say we have been demoralized or we say it is not the common man in India who is demoralised, he still holds certain basic values—not because of his rational approach but because of his inherent faith in religion and God. The demoralization process has started with those who are employed and engaged in power structure and those who are associated directly and indirectly with the existing power structure. The major forces in the power structure are politicians, industrialists, and business community, and administrators. Whereas all over the world the major components of power structure are (1) politicians (2) economists including capitalists, entrepreneurs, industrialists (3) military men. Therefore the determinant forces of moral fibre in the society are these forces. What they do influences the rest. Those who are outside this triangle, feel helpless and are led to such protection under the traditional spirituality. It is more under frustration rather than conviction that we sing frequently of the age old controversy of spiritual versus scientific point of view.

What is the solution of this seemingly moral crisis in the

society ? The immediate reaction is that we should stop aping the behaviour of open society when ours is still a closed one. The natural corollary in similar social institutions and social means of communications is that our methods and teaching and even researches are being followed without the background of Indian social bases. Where do we find 'Indian' in our country in language, in dress, in manners, in our sophistications, in courtesy—gestures, in our ideas, beliefs, interpretations and in even appreciations. Even in our emotional expression we have been imitating the foreigners. Visit any Indian after his return from abroad and you will find a change—He is an Indian in physical looks but a stranger in his cultural make up. This has been systematically done and even encouraged by people who now hold the strings of power.

Education in this context cannot stand in isolation. In an environment of corruption education in this country, being the weakest, has fallen as the first victim. The moral crisis in this country has adversely affected education, its process, techniques, tools, programmes and assessment. All are placed on a platform that lacks Indian moorings. Education in India is almost torn between Indian (Borrowed) pattern of urbanization and Indian (purely Indian) pattern of ruralization. What value system is being safeguarded by Indian education. Even our text books never stress the values that should be the corner stone of Indian life.

Unfortunately Gandhi who consistently reminded the people to be nearer Indian ways of living is forgotten. Moral life will be maintained if harmony is established between the cultural throb of the people and education. Gradually Education can play a role of modifier in a society changing according to its level of aspirations. We do not feel a common devotion to the objectives and values of Indian life for we are not clear about it.

Mere talking about setting up moral standards devoid of the realistic context will not lead us anywhere. It may add to some newslogans, some new fads.

.....

Mrs. S. Virmani,
Principal,
Govt. Co-Educational Teachers Training Institute,
Delhi.

What constitutes moral education should first be made clear. Without a comprehensive definition or perspective of the genesis of moral education we shall be groping in the dark. We need to be clear about what we want to inculcate in our students and the people. For, what may be moral in one set of circumstances may not be moral in another. The same values begin to have a different meaning in the context of its implications or results. We must, therefore, define broadly the term moral education.

The second aspect which to my mind is controversial is the term culture, for when you say 'India is an old country with a very rich culture' what does it mean? Does it mean the Hindu culture, the Muslim culture or so on and so forth or is it a combination of all these cultures? A synthesis has to be found and the term given a clearer meaning at least in the context of moral education. Taken in the span of different periods it seems incumbent that we should be able to give a clear and precise interpretation in terms of the present period.

The point that science has enlarged and influenced mankind and changed man's ways of thinking is to my mind, besides the point in the context of moral education. Moral education has nothing to do with it. Instead a detailed reference to the various isms that have influenced society at large—particularly the struggle between capitalism or socialism or communism—could have been brought to the fore. The struggle of the have-nots against the haves, the exploited against the exploiters, the impact of science in terms of industrialization which has indeed brought in a tremendous change in moral values of society, has affected the whole world in one form or another. It is here that the young and the old have risen in revolt against the established canons of thinking with regard to justice, politics, religions, ethics and economics. Unless a

brief survey of the various methods and processes of erosion of moral values in the context of these aspects is carried out no amount of thinking on moral education will have any effect whatsoever.

To my mind the main criteria of all moral education should be the good of the country. Patriotic fervour, burning desire to be of service to the country should primarily be the base of our moral education. Through the centuries our country has lacked this basic quality. Every child and adult should be imbued with the spirit of service to the country. What is correct at the international level should also be correct at the national and individual levels. All philosophy, isms and codes of conduct should be judged from the point of view of the country's benefit. Once we adopt this as our main philosophy of moral education all ills of the society present in the form of maladministration, corrupt practices, indiscipline and other maladies will begin to diminish and become most negligible. Conflict of thoughts and ideas will continue to remain for if this were not there the society will become static and march of progress arrested which in its wake will not be in the interest of the country.

.....

Dr. J. P. Vyas.

Principal,

Government College of Education

Khandwa, M. P.

It is an immensely frank and forthright paper on the subject and I congratulate you for the wide sweep of your views.

In 1967 the the Minister of Education, Government of Madhya Pradesh took up the problem of Moral Education in our schools. He associated the writer of this letter also with the formulation and implementation of the programme. We did build up some climate for the project, gave an orientation to the workers and produced a 'Nirdeshika' and a sort of a text-book for class I & II of primary schools. Unfortunately

this could not be carried through. Your monograph revives the aspiration nurtured three years back.

The concluding paragraph of your monograph sums up all thinking on this subject. But that at once indicates the vicious circle as well. No Moral Education within schools can be effective if there is an immoral or even an amoral society. And no moral society would endure without a moral education? Where would you break it? Is not moral education as necessary for the adult as it is for the young educand? The educator feels at bay, as you do and I entirely appreciate your anxiety. The dichotomy between the moral school and the immoral world is not conducive to any effort for moral education. But a beginning has to be made somewhere. And most assuredly, the school is the only place.

Accordingly I would prefer to concentrate on schools than on the world. Moral education is possible only if morally solvent personnel mans the entire educational machinery. Other sectors of our life even as they are, would eventually be influenced under the impact of moral education. The school oasis would spread to the world desert. Let us not attempt the impossible task of a total moral regeneration of everybody. Let us begin where we can and hope to catch it.

All regeneration is a continuous process, A stagnant society ultimately collapses and is thrown in the debris of history. Regeneration itself does not last if it is not kept eternally vital and dynamic.